FEBRUARY 1949 PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—The Bishop of Southwell's 'Recovery of Man'—What Does Human Life Really Mean?—The Nature of the Christian Hope—The Minority Status of the Church 113

II. PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE IN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By the Right Reverend A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby 116

III. LITERATURE 121

IV. FREUDIAN PSYCHOLOGY. By Professor J. G. M'Kenzie, M.A., D.D., Nottingham . 126

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 129
2. The Christian Year 130

VI. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION. By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D., Gerrard's Cross 135

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 138

VIII. ENTRE NOUS—Vedanta and the West—'The Plague' and 'Monsieur Vincent'—Poetry and Prayer 139

VOLUME LX. No. 5

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

Dr. SCROGGIE'S GREATEST BOOK

A GUIDE TO THE GOSPELS

By Dr. W. GRAHAM SCROGGIE

This is an entirely new work which has taken many years of patient and careful thought. In it will be found :

- The BACKGROUND and ORIGIN of the Writings.
- The MATERIAL which constitutes each of them.
- EXPOSITIONS, EXPLANATIONS and other useful data.

The Study is divided into three sections viewing the Gospels

I. SYNTHETICALLY ..	.. 128 pages
II. ANALYTICALLY ..	.. 310 pages
III. CHRISTOLOGICALLY	.. 164 pages

25/- NET

25/8 BY POST

Note :
90 ARTICLES
314 STUDIES
738 QUESTIONS
30 LISTS OF BOOKS

Write now and secure an early copy. Orders taken.

PICKERING & INGLIS LTD. 229 BOTHWELL STREET, GLASGOW, C.2
29 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.4
and Branches

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

New Books

The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley

By J. ERNEST RATTENBURY, D.D. **15s. net**

Including John Wesley's extract from Dr. Brevint's *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* and the hymns on the Lord's Supper.

Nothing could show the Wesleys' position more plainly than these hymns, and Dr. Rattenbury conducts a critical yet devotional examination of their contents. This is a book for the moment.

A Herald of the Evangelical Revival

A Critical Enquiry into the Relation of William Law to John Wesley and the Beginnings of Methodism.

By ERIC W. BAKER, M.A., Ph.D. **12s. 6d. net**

While the work deals primarily with the development of religious life in England in the 18th century, it also sheds light on certain religious issues of perennial interest, especially the Doctrines of the Atonement and Christian Perfection.

of all Booksellers

THE EPWORTH PRESS
25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.*

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE name 'Bishop of Southwell' does not suggest to many the much more familiar 'F. R. BARRY,' but when both are found together on the title-page of a book—*Recovery of Man* [1]—we feel assured of good things to come. The recently held Lambeth Conference took for its main concern the Christian Doctrine of Man, and Dr. BARRY, among others, was asked to draw up some notes for the guidance of the bishops. This book has its origin in these notes. Its subject may be stated in the author's own words: 'I believe that Christianity is the real Humanism, and because the Church is entrusted with the Gospel it is, and must be, the champion of man's cause. Christianity gives the real grounds for belief in man and hope for his recovery. For its centre is not in man but in God.'

In establishing this conclusion Dr. BARRY begins with the assertion that the Church lives in history, not in the sacristy or in a vacuum. And because it is in the world its task cannot be defined apart from the various secular historical movements that are contemporary. Therefore at different points in history some aspects of Christian faith and doctrine will be specially relevant to the world's need. It can hardly be doubted that at this moment the chief emphasis must be laid on that interpretation of the nature of man which inheres in the Christian knowledge of God and the world view which it implies. This is the crucial issue of our time. All other questions run back into this one.

The dividing line in the world to-day is not that between Left and Right, or between Capitalism and Socialism—these differences are superficial, and may be said to be little more than verbal. It is between two ultimate philosophies, two interpretations of life, two answers to the question: What is Man? Summarily it is a choice between a theological or religious answer, with the God of the Bible at the centre of it, and a secular or humanistic, with man, or chance, or nothing at all at the centre of it.

[1] Nisbet; 8s. 6d. net.

If we answer the question wrongly we are planning for disaster. What is man and what is the end and purpose of society? What does human life really *mean*? Behind that is the theological question; and most of the urgent questions of the hour are unanswerable apart from theology. A theological answer to the question means setting it in the framework and context of a God-centred world-view, such as has in the past been the constant background of the European and Christian culture. On a secular, or merely empirical, basis there is no possible answer to the question other than the limits of power to enforce the desires of one group or another. For there is no ultimate court of appeal, no absolute truth and no moral law.

The abandonment of absolutes swamps ethical standards in relativity. The new model post-Renaissance state claims to be the source of its own law and its own moral justification, and this is the lie in the soul of the modern West. There can be neither justice nor freedom without the recognition of a moral law which all acknowledge and by which all are judged. It is interesting to reflect that it was into a psychological situation strangely and frighteningly like our own that the Christian religion first came. The Hellenistic Age might be described, like ours, as an age of humanism *manqué*. The proclamation of the gospel of God in the ancient world had as its result the re-affirmation and re-vindication of the status and dignity of man. For lack of a valid philosophy to justify it or a credible religion to sanction it, the Hellenistic culture was beginning to turn back on its heritage of humanism and losing confidence in its own assumptions. The spirit of man was breaking under the strain of trying to uphold human values without belief in a God to guarantee them. What Christianity brought was faith in life itself, and that made a new spiritual climate in which creative solutions were made possible.

There is to-day, as there was then, a 'humanism' which was secular. It has many varieties of expression, ranging from the refinement of Gilbert

Murray through the positivism of H. G. Wells to the anti-God propaganda of the Rationalists—as they so paradoxically call themselves. It is a mistake to think that the moral principles of this secular humanism are the same as those of Christianity, lacking only theological sanctions. It often speaks of 'spiritual values' and reveres Beauty, Truth, and Goodness. It often evinces a religious temper, and acknowledges a high sense of moral and social obligation.

But it is at heart anthropocentric not theocentric, so that there is a contradiction at the heart of it which brings it in the end to bankruptcy. Art, ethics, religion are regarded, not as response to a God 'outside' ourselves but as creations of man's moral consciousness, innate spirituality and 'idealism.' This has gradually taken shape in the current secular world-view—the belief that by more science, more technology, better education and social conditions, men will 'move upward working out the brute' and establish a man-made paradise on earth. This is the religion of the modern man.

What modern 'humanism' misses is the real problem, deliverance from *sin*. Sin, Dr. BARRY says, is man's melancholy privilege, not a hangover from sub-human ancestry but a sign of his moral and spiritual endowment. An animal may make a false choice which is without ethical significance. But only a child of God can commit sin. Thus it is that by a resounding moral paradox the very fact of man's fallen state is evidence of his Divine origin and therefore contains the pledge of his restoration. This does not minimize its gravity, but it sets the problem in its true perspective. It sets it within the framework of redemption where it can be regarded from the standpoint which must be the centre of all Christian thinking—not the failure of man but the victory of God.

It will be seen, therefore, that conviction of sin is a fairly advanced *religious* experience. It presupposes a vivid awareness of God, and of our responsibility before Him. Thus much of our preaching starts at the wrong end. The sense of sin is part of our growth in grace, and can be left to take care of itself. What we should lament is that people who need salvation do not know where to look for it, that in their spiritual destitution they cannot find the fountain of living waters.

The world to-day is inhabited by sick souls, conscious of inward conflict and of disharmony, and of being in some way which they cannot fathom out of right relation to 'life,' and the governing forces of the universe. This deep sense of frustration and resentment were incarnated in Hitler and his satellites, and without a more radical and effective cure, based on a more profound diagnosis, it will seek again an equivalent compensation in some final revolution of destruction. But there are signs already that thinking people are attempting to solve it at a deeper level. Men are being seized by the misgiving that man, who has learnt that he cannot save himself, is left alone in his failure and defeat.

That is not the language of the New Testament but the need which it describes is identical. The need for forgiveness — reconciliation with the Purpose of Goodness at the heart of life—is indeed precisely that need of which men are once again becoming conscious. And the answer is that God does not wait till sinful man becomes worthy of forgiveness, but that He has taken the initiative to overcome the moral contradiction between temporal history and the eternal goodness. All genuine Christian faith in God and all hope of recovery for man are rooted and grounded in this proclamation. The good news which the gospel proclaims is that we are not alone. The permanent meaning of the Christian doctrines which undergird and elucidate the gospel is that God cares for men and women, that the universe is committed to Jesus, and that God has taken the cause of man for His own.

Dr MAX WARREN, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, has published a thoughtful study in 'the nature of the Christian Hope'—*The Truth of Vision*.[1] It consists of eight essays on widely ranging topics, yet all inspired by the conviction that, as the Biblical perspective declares, history and time possess real importance: 'In the events of history God acts. This continuing activity is the ground of Christian Hope.'

The action of God that is here chiefly in view is His guidance of the Christian Church in the last two centuries—a guidance so firm and effective that it has become and is becoming, often against the inclinations of a large part of its membership, a missionary Church. The result is that it possesses three distinguishing characteristics in the modern world: continuing expansion, growing unity, and a minority status. It is the last-named to which we draw attention in this Note.

[1] Canterbury Press; 9s. 6d. net.

Great questions are brought before the reader of these pages, such as the relation of the Church to contemporary culture and to the State, the function of the Church in education (the discussion is focussed on Christian education in Africa), the importance for the Church of the Ecumenical Movement, and the inner meaning of the missionary task. But affecting the Church's attitude in all these questions is the fact of its minority status.

Take it in the context of the culture and the State. The Church must in its missionary task seek to penetrate the culture to which it is in some degree assimilated, which involves the Church in a quite indispensable tension. *In* that culture it can never be wholly *of* it. Detachment and devotion, withdrawal and return, should be its twofold movement. And part of the strength of the Church's position as a minority lies in this, that for a minority detachment and withdrawal is more possible than for a majority.

Again, the Church must also in its missionary task seek to penetrate the State and bring it to acknowledge the true source of its own inherent power. The Church must not allow the State to wield the spiritual sword. On the other hand, it must not for its part attempt to wield the temporal sword. Here, once more, it is evident that the Church must balance its devotion with detachment, and withdraw that it may return.

Take it in the context of education. As a minority community in the world the Church is deeply concerned with the aim and goal of education. Not only does it seek to educate its own members towards the 'end' which it pursues, it is involved in the education which is provided by the State. 'The most vital need of this time is to infuse a sense of urgency into those responsible for a Christian philosophy of education; the kind of urgency which frankly recognizes that we are living in a revolutionary and not an evolutionary situation, and that Christian education in school has to prepare the boys and girls for membership of a minority community, which has a dynamic programme by which it prepares itself and the wider community for the Kingdom of God.'

Take it in the context of the Ecumenical Movement. While for the Church it is of small moment that it should be a minority community so long as it reveals its own inner integrity, it should be recognized to be of the inner integrity of the Church that it should be in conformity with the will of God in the matter of unity. The Church should be one 'that the world may believe.' That is the faith that inspires the World Council of Churches (though it is not, as the name suggests, an all-inclusive Council, notably the Church of Rome standing outside, 'self-isolated in its pride').

Take it in the context of the missionary task. For the Church as a Christian minority two qualities are needed above all if it is to prepare for the 'end,' which is the triumph of God *in* history. The first is mobility. If the Church is to demonstrate to the world the rightness of the righteousness of God, it must be mobile, and mobility demands a partnership that will deepen into unity. The second is flexibility, so that wide scope may be given for every possible initiative on the part of its members.

In enforcement of this last point we conclude with a quotation that is characteristic of the author's style: 'The task of Christian witness in the world is so complex, the forces threatening the Christian minorities in every country in the world are so vast that the maximum of freedom is called for in the fulfilment of the Church's missionary vocation. . . . To talk about global missionary strategy is to surrender to the intoxication of verbiage. It is to fall a victim to titanism. The very nature of the *paroikiai* which it is the task of the missionary movement to serve demands a personal knowledge and a personal devotion and concern which is quite beyond the compass of any centralized bureaucracy. De-centralization of the missionary enterprise, not centralization, is the clamant need of to-day. With de-centralization should go an organization of the maximum flexibility which would spread the spirit of initiative throughout the whole movement.'

Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity.

By the Right Reverend A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby.

The Hebrew word *kohen*, used in the earlier books of the Old Testament to denote the professional guardian or custodian of a shrine, in the Book of Deuteronomy to denote the so-called 'Levite priests,' and in the Priests' Code to denote the 'priests the sons of Aaron' as distinguished from the rest of the Levitical 'tribe,' was in the Septuagint rendered by ἱερεύς and in the Vulgate by *sacerdos*. Both the Greek and the Latin words thus used had the general meaning of sacred or holy personage, dedicated to the immediate service of the gods, often with specific reference to the performance of holy rites, and in particular to the offering of sacrifices. The Hebrew *kohen* is indeed more than simply a sacrificial functionary: it belongs also to his office to be an exponent of the 'law' or 'teaching' (*torah*) of God.[1] But in the ritual of sacrifice as practised in Judaism the priests played an indispensable part. In the case of animal sacrifices in particular the most significant part of the ritual—the pouring, dashing, or sprinkling of blood upon the altar, after the victim had first been slain [2]—was reserved to the priests, and might not be performed by a lay Israelite. Ministry in the sanctuary and at the altar was commonly regarded as being the most characteristic of priestly functions, and in the general mind of developed Judaism priesthood and sacrifice had in effect come to be looked upon as being more or less correlative terms.

The word 'sacrifice' is, in its turn, a term of wide meaning. St. Augustine, in the *De Civitate Dei*, after remarking that all the manifold precepts concerning sacrifices, Divinely enjoined in the Old Testament in connexion with the service of the tabernacle or temple, are interpreted by Christians as being intended to signify love to God and one's neighbour, goes on to observe that 'whatever action is done to the end that we may by a holy fellowship inhere in God is a true sacrifice.'[3] Alike in Judaism and in the Gentile religious thought of the New Testament period the term 'sacrifice' had in fact come to be used in a number of metaphorical ways. In its proper and primary meaning, however, it denoted (as the ancients, familiar with the living tradition of ritual sacrifice, knew quite well) an actual and literal religious ceremony, in which some kind of oblation was regarded as being offered to God.

The origins of sacrifice, and especially of the practice of offering animals in sacrifice, were doubtless lowly and primitive. Robertson Smith, who believed that the origins of sacrifice were in all or in most cases totemistic, held that the 'communion feast' type of sacrifice was earlier in date and correspondingly more primitive than the type of sacrifice in which there was a gift or offering made over to God. The beginnings of all types of sacrifice, according to this view, were to be regarded as going back to a period and to usages in which primitive tribes banqueted horribly upon the raw flesh of their totem animal, thereby renewing within themselves, by means of participation in the blood (=the life), the sacred bond whereby they were linked in the fellowship of a common Divine life, shared between themselves and their deity. Other authorities hold (with the late Dr. W. Buchanan Gray) that the 'gift' type of sacrifice is at least equally primitive with the other. Certainly in the religion of the Old Testament (which in any case is not that of primitive savages) the two conceptions or types of sacrifices—the 'gift' type and the 'common meal' type—stand side by side.

The Old Testament in fact knows of sacrifices of a variety of different types and kinds. There is in the first place a division to be made between animal and vegetable sacrifices—between offerings (as the Old Testament itself would express it) 'of the fruit of the land' and 'of the herd and of the flock.' Corn and wine, oil, salt, and frankincense were all offered to God as 'gifts' or sacrifices. In the developed ritual of Judaism incense was daily burnt in the Temple, and on the *Table of Shewbread* offerings of bread and wine were set forth and renewed weekly. Side by side with the vegetable offerings were the animal sacrifices—of three main types.[4] We may distinguish (1) the *sin offering*, in which purification was made by means of the victim's blood (identified in Lv 17^{11} with the principle of *life*), the rest of the carcase (save for the fat, which was burnt on the

[1] Hag $2^{11ff.}$, Zech 7^{3}; cf. Hos 4^{6}, Mal 2^{7}.

[2] The slaying of the victim was a preliminary to this, and had as its purpose the setting free of the blood, which was identified with the life (Lv 17^{11}). Except when the sacrifice was being offered by the priests on behalf of themselves, the actual slaughter of the victims was not normally the work of priests.

[3] *Proinde verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaereamus Deo* (Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, X. vi.).

[4] The 'guilt' or 'trespass' offering (Lv $5^{14ff.}$ 6^{6}, Nu 5^{6-10}), in effect a specialized variant of the 'sin' offering, need not be here separately considered.

altar) being either consumed by the priests or (in the case of sin-offerings on behalf either of the priests themselves or of the people as a whole) burnt, to dispose of it, 'outside the camp'—that is, outside the walls of Jerusalem; (2) the *burnt offering or holocaust*, in which the carcase of the animal slaughtered was wholly consumed by fire; and (3) the *peace-offering*, in which the blood was poured on the altar and the fat burnt thereon, but the rest of the carcase was eaten, the breast and thigh by the priests and the remainder by the offerer and his friends.

Offerings of these three kinds—sin-offerings, burnt-offerings, peace-offerings—are, in the completed system of the Old Testament, commonly found in sequence, and in that order: and in this there is appropriateness. 'Before sinful man can draw near to God,' it has been written, 'he needs something to remove the barrier between himself and God, something to "make atonement"[1] for himself.' This is provided by the sin-offering. When the sin-barrier is removed, he is free to dedicate himself afresh to God, and it is his duty to do so; and this was the 'intention' of the *burnt-offering*. Finally, in the *peace-offering* the sacrificer expressed that sense of fellowship with God, which is the Divine response to self-dedication.[2] (It is worth noticing that in the Communion Service in the Anglican Prayer Book the making memorial of the Lord's 'one oblation of himself once offered' as 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world' stands in correspondence with the *sin-offering*; the offering of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice' to God corresponds in idea with the *holocaust* or *burnt-offering*; the reception of communion corresponds in idea with the *peace-offering* or sacrificial meal. In the original order of the central eucharistic prayer or 'canon'—broken up by Cranmer, but restored in the 1928 rite and in all Anglican liturgies later in date than 1662 in different parts of the world—the three sacrificial correspondences or moments in the Liturgy are still found in the same order as in the Old Testament, which indeed, in the opinion of a majority of liturgical scholars, is the appropriate and logical order.)

Apart from the above-mentioned three or (if the guilt-offering be included) four kinds of animal sacrifice, reference should be made also to the *sacrifice inaugurating a 'covenant'* (Ex 24^{8}, with which should be compared Jer 31^{31} and its New Testament parallels[3]) and the *sacrifice of the Passover*. It is possible that in the case of the latter the primary emphasis originally was upon the smearing of the door-posts of the houses with blood as a protection against plague.[4] In developed Hebrew usage it had come to be interpreted (even though the door-post ceremony was retained) as being essentially a solemn annual rite of thanksgiving, commemorative of God's deliverance of His people from Egypt—a ceremony destined to prove capable of being re-interpreted in New Testament thought as a foreshadowing and symbol of redemption through Christ.

As a matter of actual historical fact it was at Passover-time that Jesus was crucified. Whether or not the Last Supper was itself the Paschal meal,[5] Paschal ideas and associations were certainly linked with it. The Church already in the days of the first generation of Christians interpreted the annual recurrence of Passover-time as marking for Christians the great annual commemoration of the Deliverance wrought by Christ for the People of God, just as the observance of the Lord's Day commemorated it weekly—'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us,' writes St. Paul, 'therefore let us keep the feast.'[6]

In actual fact the identification of Christ with the Paschal Lamb was only one among many interpretations of the significance of His Passion in terms suggested by various types of the ritual of sacrifice. Once granted the interpretation of the Saviour's death as a sacrifice, the whole rich, many-sided theology of priesthood and sacrifice in the New Testament becomes intelligible as a development. The question still remains: What was it that suggested the primary clue? We are ourselves so familiar with the interpretation in question that we often forget to remind ourselves how paradoxical it was. The word 'sacrifice' in the ancient world was a well-understood term. It denoted primarily, as we have seen, a concrete religious rite, in which some kind of oblation was ceremonially offered and dedicated to God. The crucifixion of our Lord, as to its outward character and form, was a Roman military execution—that and nothing more. How did the idea first begin to arise that it was, or that it might be, interpretable in terms of the conception of sacrifice?

I have myself elsewhere suggested that the clue

[1] The word translated 'make atonement' (*kipper*) has been thought to mean 'cover' or 'wipe'; 'purge' or 'wipe away' might serve as translations in different contexts.

[2] S. C. Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, 52.

[3] Mk 14^{24}, Mt 26^{28}, Lk 22^{20} (longer text); 1 Co 11^{25}, He 9^{14-15}.

[4] Ex 12^{13}.

[5] According to Mk 14^{12}, Lk 22^{7}, the Last Supper appears to have coincided with the Paschal meal; according to Jn 19^{14} the death of the Saviour occurred on Passover eve. For a discussion of the resulting problem see my edition of *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 262–267.

[6] 1 Co 5^{7}.

was supplied by the Last Supper. Jesus, by His actions and words on that last occasion, on the eve of His Passion, was 'deliberately consecrating His death (now foreseen to be imminent) to be a sacrifice to God on behalf of His people. . . . *It is the Last Supper which makes Calvary sacrificial.* It was not the death upon Calvary *per se*, but the death upon Calvary as the Last Supper interprets it and gives the clue to its meaning, which constitutes our Lord's sacrifice. The doctrine of sacrifice (and of atonement) was not, as I believe, read *into* the Last Supper: it was read out of it. It was the Last Supper which afforded the clue.'[1]

So soon, however, as the clue had been grasped, Christian theology without hesitation went on to discern in the sacrificial self-offering of Christ the Reality of which every Old Testament sacrifice, according to the Divine intention, had been but a foreshadowing and type. Of the observances of Judaism as a whole St. Paul lays it down as a principle that they are 'a shadow of things to come; but the body' [the reality which casts the shadow] 'is Christ's.'[2] The English translators of St. Thomas Aquinas' great eucharistic hymn[3] suggest by their rendering

> Types and shadows have their ending,
> For the newer rite is here

that they regard St. Paul's words as being directly capable of being applied without more ado to the Eucharist. In the New Testament age it may well be that no such directly eucharistic application of St. Paul's principle was as yet in men's minds. But the step involved was a short one. It required merely an extension of the idea of a fulfilment of Old Testament types from the Christ Himself in His life upon earth, in His death upon Calvary, and in the continuing exercise in the unseen world of His prevailing High Priesthood, to the familiar outward observance whereby, in the midst of the Church in time and in history, there is set forth in the context of worship and by means of a dramatic re-enactment of the Last Supper ritual the continual representation or μίμησις of the Lord's sacrificial life-offering on behalf of mankind.

Certain it is that in Christian antiquity the Eucharist was regarded from the earliest times as being in some sort a sacrifice. St. Paul, by his comparison and contrast of the 'table of the Lord' with the 'table of demons,'[4] makes it quite evident that he regards the Christian observance as falling within the same general category as the sacrificial feasts of the non-Christian religious world. As early as the end of the first century Clement of Rome is found writing of those who have 'holily and without offence offered the gifts pertaining to the bishop's office,'[5] where the 'bishop's office' appears to be that of the celebrant, and the offering of the 'gifts' seems to refer to the people's oblation of bread and wine for the Eucharist. At a later but still early date[6] the Eucharist came to be known as the 'unbloody sacrifice' (ἀναίμακτος θυσία), presumably because, notwithstanding the fact that it was an offering or pleading in the sight of God of the Lord's sacrificial self-offering, and a setting forth of His death, it involved no literal shedding of blood—the Lord's death was in the Eucharist represented simply in a figure: to offer the Bread is to 'make the likeness' (in Sarapion's phrase) of our Lord's death, and to offer the Cup is to 'present a likeness of the blood.' The author of the *Didache*, perhaps two centuries earlier, echoing a verse from the Book of Malachi, applies the term 'sacrifice' to the eucharistic oblation ('having first confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure').[7] Justin Martyr and Irenaeus similarly both interpret the 'pure offering' of Mal 1^{11} as being a prophecy fulfilled in the Christian Eucharist. The word 'altar' in contexts which appear to be eucharistic occurs twice in Ignatius.[8] Later patristic writers from the time of St. Irenæus onwards freely apply sacrificial terms to the Eucharist. It is not necessary for our immediate purposes to go beyond the patristic age. The language of the early writers who have been quoted is simple, unprecise and spontaneous: it avoids later mistakes and errors; and it is wholly uncontroversial, inasmuch as no controversies with regard to the doctrine of the eucharistic Sacrifice had thus far arisen.

Ignoring the intervening centuries, I proceed to quote from a statement drawn up some months ago in America, portions of which have appeared in the English Church press. The relevant words are as follows:

'The Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and the elements ordained by Him, is the supreme act of sacramental worship in the Christian Church. This Sacrament is a corporate act of the Church towards God, wherein it is united with its Lord, victorious and triumphant, Himself both Priest

[1] *Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by English and German Theologians* (ed. by Bell and Deissmann), 241.

[2] Col 2^{17}.

[3] The Latin original does not by its wording suggest any echo of Col 2^{17}.

[4] 1 Co 10^{18-22}.

[5] 1 Clement xliv. 4.

[6] Perhaps not earlier than the middle of the fourth century (the phrase is said to have been first used by Cyril of Jerusalem, but is used also by Athanasius and by Sarapion of Thmuis).

[7] *Didache* 14^{1}.

[8] Ignatius, *ad Ephes.*, 5; *ad Philad.*, 4.

and Victim in the sacrifice of the Cross. In it the faithful continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ who is their Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for their sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first they offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: then they plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the Cross, and by it they confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for the whole Church; and lastly they offer the sacrifice of themselves to the Creator of all things which they have already signified by the oblations of the bread and wine which are His creatures.'

The emphasis in this American statement upon the essentially *corporate* character of the Church's eucharistic offering is wholly in line with Biblical and early patristic thought, as it is also with the outlook characteristic of the Orthodox Churches of Eastern Christendom (contrasting here in their emphasis with what eventually came to be the more individualistic tendency of Latin Catholicism) down to this day. 'They therefore,' writes Clement of Rome, 'that make their offerings at the appointed season are acceptable and blessed; for while they follow the institutions of the Master they cannot go wrong. For unto the high priest his proper services have been assigned and to the priests their proper place has been enjoined, and upon the levites their proper ministries are laid: the layman is bound by layman's assignments.' [1]

In this passage, the terminology of which is derived from the Old Testament, but which appears otherwise to reflect the order of worship in the primitive eucharistic assembly of the Church in the sub-apostolic period at Rome, the 'high priest' is (as we should say) the celebrant —presumably, if monepiscopacy existed so early, the bishop—who in the liturgy has his 'proper services' to perform; the 'priests,' to whom their 'proper place' is assigned, are the presbyters, sitting in special seats; the 'levites' are the deacons, doing the deacons' part in the primitive liturgy; the layman too has his specific appointed part to play. All is orderly; different ranks in the hierarchy (for already there *is* a hierarchy) have each their assigned functions; and there is a no less indispensable part to be played by the laity. The whole is a single organic act of corporate worship. The Church, as a worshipping community, is conceived as being in a true sense hierarchical and priestly. Christians, like Jews, are a 'royal priesthood,' a nation of 'kings and priests unto God.' [2] There is therefore a corporate priesthood of the Church as a whole. But *within* the Church—in the New Israel, as in the Old—there is an ordained ministry, who (as being specifically set apart for ministerial and liturgical service) came to be described and regarded as constituting in a special sense the Lord's 'portion' or κλῆρος (clergy): and to them (or rather to their chief) belongs the office of leadership in worship and of 'presidency' (to use Justin Martyr's phrase) in the offering of the Eucharist.

The use of the terms ἀρχιερεύς and ἱερεύς ('high priest' and 'priest') in Greek, and of *sacerdos* or *summus sacerdos* in Latin, at an early date came into vogue to denote Christian bishops and presbyters. The usage already obtains, as we have seen, by the time of Clement of Rome. There is nothing particularly sinister in the implication of the terms in question, as thus originally used. A 'priest' or a 'high priest,' in this usage, is simply a person who, in virtue of the place which he holds in the Church's ordered ministry, is the appropriate and natural person to play the celebrant's part in the Eucharist. For a long period in Early Church usage the normal celebrant in each local Church was the Bishop, who accordingly could be described either as *summus sacerdos*, the 'chief priest' of a community—the Church of Christ—which as a whole constituted a 'kingdom of priests,' or (more simply) as *sacerdos*, a 'sacred functionary,' because making, on behalf of the people and in their name, the eucharistic 'offering,' as their liturgical leader in worship. Not for a long time—not for a good many centuries—did the ideas grow up against which Luther and other Reformers reacted with such violence: the idea (for example) that, in any but the most strictly functional and representative sense, the offering was made, or the sacrifice offered, by the celebrant in his individual capacity, and apart from the people; the further and still more objectionable notion that in the Eucharist there was a sacrifice offered which was in some sense additional to, and distinguishable from (even though, of course, still related to and linked with), the sacrifice of Calvary, so that each 'Mass' could be regarded as having its own special efficacy, and two 'Masses' as being better than one; or again, the idea (popularly prevalent as a corollary of the erroneous notion that sacrifice primarily consisted in the infliction of death rather than in the offering and dedication of life) that in each Eucharist Christ was, in some mystical sense, slain over again.

It was in violent reaction against such crude popular teaching, current in late mediæval Catholicism, that Luther and others repudiated without qualification any and every idea of the so-called 'sacrifice of the Mass,' at the same time

[1] 1 Clement xl. 5.
[2] 1 P 2^9, Rev 1^6 5^{10}, Ex 19^6.

rejecting no less decisively the whole idea of any priesthood specifically exercised by the clergy, as distinct from the general priesthood of all believers; and undoubtedly the abuses attacked by the Reformers were real enough, and their reactions intelligible. But it is none the less true that much of the argumentation was at cross purposes. The Protestants, still sharing the mediæval notion that sacrifice consisted primarily in an act of slaughter or of destruction, and rightly desirous of getting rid of the idea of a repeated and reiterated slaying of Christ, were led to deny that the Eucharist could in any true sense be regarded with propriety as having the character of a sacrifice. Catholics, rightly perceiving and maintaining that the term 'sacrifice' was legitimately (as it was certainly traditionally) applied to the Eucharist, wrongly concluded (since, like the Protestants, they too shared in the late mediæval misunderstanding of sacrifice) that in every offering of the Eucharist there was involved, at the least, what was described as a 'mystical' slaughter of Christ. So also, while Protestants clung to the truth of the 'priesthood of all believers' (in itself a fully Biblical and catholic idea), there was among them but little inquiry or explanation as to what precisely the phrase meant; and the assumption was strangely made that the truth of the generalized priesthood of the People of God, as taught in Scripture, precluded the recognition in any sense of any specialized priesthood.

In modern times it is sometimes maintained that only 'Catholics' (a term interpreted as including Anglicans) have 'priesthood,' and that the ministers of 'Protestant' or non-Episcopalian churches do not claim to be 'priests.' The latter statement is not seldom quite true; but it does not mean that those who thus repudiate for themselves a 'sacerdotal' type of ministry regard other kinds of ministers as being 'priests'; it means that they simply rule out altogether the 'sacerdotal' or 'priestly' interpretation of the functions of the Christian ministry as being false. The members of a whole school of thought within Anglicanism, notwithstanding their own ordination at the hands of Bishops standing in what is technically known as the 'Apostolic Succession,' would agree with them in this. The matter does not in fact turn upon ordination within or without that Succession, but (as has already been argued) upon a question of theological terminology and opinion. The term *sacerdos*, applied originally to bishops and later also to presbyters (regarded, in proportion as the celebration of the Eucharist by members of the second order of the Ministry became widespread and normal, as being sharers in the bishop's *sacerdotium*), denoted in practice, as we have seen, simply a person qualified to act as a liturgical celebrant of the Eucharist, regarded as a sacrificial rite. 'Protestant' ministers claim, equally with 'Catholics,' to be qualified celebrants of the Eucharist; if they should ever come to take a sacrificial view of it (as, with the growth of what is believed to be a more accurate understanding of what is meant by such terms as 'priesthood' and 'sacrifice,' Anglicans, in increasing numbers, have done), they would presumably claim, equally with Anglicans and with other 'Catholics,' to be ministerial 'priests.' The doctrine of the 'priesthood of all believers' is in no way in conflict with such a view. It is a doctrine which is the common possession of both 'Protestants' and 'Catholics'; but what it means is that members of the New Israel, like members of the Old, belong to a royal and priestly race and are sharers in the Church's common and corporate priesthood. It does not of itself constitute a layman either a bishop or a presbyter, nor does it entitle him to usurp their functions. It does, however, mean that a Christian layman, in virtue of his baptism, is ordainable to the Christian ministry, and that he is therefore potentially capable of becoming a priest or a bishop, as an unbaptised person is not.

The question remains as to whether or not (and, if so, in what circumstances) the Church ought to be prepared to regard as permissible the ministration of the sacraments by those who have not been ordained. The Catholic tradition admits the legitimacy, in case of emergency, of lay Baptism, but (denying that there could ever be, in the strict sense, any compelling necessity for the celebration of the Eucharist in the absence of a priest) instructs the faithful, if deprived of the opportunity of sacramental participation, to content themselves with the making of what is described as an act of 'spiritual communion.' The 'Protestant' tradition commonly forbids lay Baptism, but, in the absence of any ordained minister, is prepared to countenance the authorization of laymen to act as celebrants of the Holy Communion. The contrast is an interesting one. St. Thomas Aquinas, rationalizing and interpreting the received Catholic tradition, after defending lay Baptism, proceeds to argue in respect of the Eucharist that 'the reception of this Sacrament is not of such necessity as is that of Baptism,' and that 'accordingly, although in case of necessity a layman may baptize, he yet cannot consummate this sacrament.'[1] St. Thomas in his discussion of the matter shows himself fully alive to the truth of the priesthood of the laity, and explicitly quotes Ro 12^1 and 1 Pe 2^5 in support of it. He

[1] *Perceptio hujus sacramenti non est tantae necessitatis sicut perceptio baptismi . . . ideo licet in necessitatis articulo laicus potest baptizare, non tamen potest hoc sacramentum conficere* (*Summa*, *Q.* LXXXII. *A.* 1).

does not, however, regard it as being in this connexion of any particular relevance. He does not in fact argue the question in terms of the conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice at all. He maintains simply that the eucharistic Sacrament is of such intrinsic dignity that it can only be celebrated by one who acts 'in the person of Christ,' that no one can act *in persona alterius* unless the power of doing so has been expressly conceded to him, and that this power is conferred only in ordination. Accordingly, it is the received doctrine of Catholicism that the celebration of the Eucharist by a layman would be 'invalid,' on the ground that the full conditions requisite to validity would not be present, even though it might be conceded that in particular circumstances a lay Eucharist, celebrated in good faith and in ignorance of the proper requirements, would be 'efficacious.'

Meanwhile, challenging both Protestant and Catholic traditions (but especially the latter), there is the argument of Tertullian, who in a well-known passage appears to derive from the doctrine of the priesthood of the laity the conclusion that, in the absence of all the clergy, a layman could both offer the Eucharist and baptize, all by himself. 'Are not even we laymen priests?' he writes. 'It is the authority of the Church which makes a difference between the ordained ministry and the people. . . . Accordingly, where there is no bench of clergy, you offer and baptize and are priest alone to yourself.'[1] Tertullian here certainly appears to regard the principle involved in lay Baptism as being logically applicable also to the case of a lay Eucharist, finding a basis for both in the 'royal priesthood' of all Christians, in support of which he quotes in the context Rev 1[6]. It is an arguable position, and it may well be that, in the course of the coming negotiations between Anglicans and non-Anglicans with a view to reunion, the questions implicitly posed by Tertullian will have to be faced. If a layman may in emergency baptize, why may he not in emergency also act as the celebrant of the Eucharist? If the answer be given in terms of St. Thomas' argument with regard to the 'dignity' of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, why is the 'dignity' of the primary Christian sacrament of Holy Baptism not equally great? Why in this matter should there be a distinction drawn between Baptism and Holy Communion? It is not easy to see on what real ground of strict theological principle the distinction can rest. But I do not answer these questions. I am content to have suggested them. Perhaps some theologian may be led to put forward a considered reply.

[1] *Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? . . . Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas. . . . Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus.* (Tert., *de exhort. cast.* 7.)

Literature.

THE LAST THINGS.

Some of the best books are not those which break new ground but those which lucidly describe and appraise the ground already secured. One such has just appeared. It is *The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things,'* by the Rev. H. A. Guy, B.A., B.D., Divinity Master in Taunton's School, Southampton (Oxford University Press; 10s. 6d. net).

For half a century now, the storm-centre in the field of New Testament interpretation has been eschatology. Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer really set the scholars their problem; and in the last few decades book after book has tried to make better sense of the eschatological data than they did. 'Futurist' eschatology has given place to 'realized eschatology'; but though we now know that Schweitzer's general picture was wrong, we are not quite sure whether C. H. Dodd is wholly right.

This is the debate which Mr. Guy summarizes so admirably in less than two hundred pages. He starts with a chapter on every man's concern with eschatology; goes on to review the eschatological data of the Synoptic Gospels; considers the views of the Primitive Church and St. Paul; writes an admirable chapter on Hebrews; describes the 'futurist eschatology' of Revelation; finely characterizes the 'sublimated' doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, and in his last chapter asks and answers the question, How far can Christians to-day make the New Testament views on the Last Things their own?

This strikes us as a very sound and scholarly book for the non-expert who wants to know what the experts think. It is short. It is clear. It is abreast of the latest research. Mr. Guy does not always tell us where he himself stands. But it is tolerably clear that he has much sympathy with the 'realized' eschatologists, and he doubts whether Jesus ever spoke of His 'coming again.' Specially valuable is Mr. Guy's demonstration of Matthew's tendency to 'pile it on' eschatologically and Luke's proneness to 'tone down' the apocalyptic elements. And there is a real recognition of the essential unity of the New Testament writers in the sphere of eschatology.

Some of Mr. Guy's comments on detail do not always persuade us; for example, his translation of Lk 11^{20}, 'The kingdom of God has *unexpectedly* arrived,' or his view that 'the coming one' in John the Baptist's question was Elijah. But the book, as a whole, shows a balanced judgment and in details it is often illuminating. We commend it warmly to all hard-working ministers who want to know what the experts are saying on this fundamental theme.

It is strange to find in a book printed by the Oxford University Press so many errors. See pp. 55, 59, 79 and 125. And would it not be better on p. 98 to spell 'three-storied' as 'three-storeyed'?

A. M. HUNTER.

SUNRISE IN THE WEST.

In *American Humanism and the New Age*, by Professor Louis A. J. Mercier, A.M., Litt.D. (Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee; $4.00), a number of themes are presented. One is Roman propaganda. A very sympathetic description of other communions leads up to an earnest plea that the only way to recognize the essential unity of the Church is to find it in the Church that has authoritatively taught since 'Abraham was called by God 420 years after the Deluge.' The Church, 'whose main foundation indeed is Christ,' rests upon Peter; and since it is to last to the end of time 'the conclusion inevitably follows that the supreme authority bestowed upon Peter must continue with his successors.' A supernatural revelation, because it transcends reason, must have an external guarantee from God Himself, and this is supplied by Papal Infallibility.

The Roman mind is also shown in the sort of spiritual mathematics of such statements as, 'the intensity of heavenly bliss will be in proportion to the amount of sanctifying grace in the soul'; and, 'we shall not only receive more actual graces but have an increase of sanctifying grace'; grace being thus conceived as a commodity to be had in bulk as a general influence, and also in packets for specific purposes.

Another part of the book is an intriguing but tantalizingly inadequate account of certain experiments in university education in America in the last ten years. Attributing the bias of American colleges toward a materialistic outlook to the elective system which allows the selection of a course of variegated options chosen for their technical or vocational value, they offer the drastic reform of a compulsory course aimed at gleaning from the greatest books of all the ages their spiritual message.

One main argument in the volume is practical in its purpose; it is that apart from revelation human reason can and does achieve a definite Theism and a recognition of natural Law; and that, therefore, in view of the remote prospects of the conversion of the world or even of the reunion of the churches, there ought to be, in opposition to the materialism of monistic science, an immediate alliance of all who in any way believe in God and a moral order.

As the title, however, suggests, the largest part of Mercier's book is a carefully documented account of the new dawn in American speculation seen in the writings of a number of professors who have recoiled and revolted from the materialist philosophy in which they were bred. Those who are interested will find here an elaborate study of the thinking of Irving Babbitt, Paul More, R. M. Hutchins, Walter Lippmann and Norman Foerster, and a vigorous assertion that a dualistic outlook is alone compatible with the spiritual facts of human experience.

One comic touch is unconscious. Quoting from a student, who died young, the lines,

> O for a lifeless world to lie in
> Not to be born in, not to die in,

Mercier comments wistfully, 'Had he lived, the evolution of his thought would have been poignant.'

R. W. STEWART.

ARCHBISHOP TENISON.

Under the stress of the War years the Rev. Edward Carpenter, M.A., Ph.D., B.D., strove to preserve his own sanity in a mad world in London by labouring on a book which is now published —*Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury* (S.P.C.K.; 30s. net). A right goodly volume it is; and the making of it has clearly involved a great deal of research. Tenison has been the subject of books before now, but none of the writers of those seems to have consulted the original documents with anything like the diligence and patience which Dr. Carpenter expended on his task. Tenison was one of the most outstanding figures in a disturbed and dramatic period of the history of Britain and of the Church of England. The part he played in those public affairs is the only thing for which a book about him could be written; of his personal and private relationships next to nothing is known.

His life covered the period 1636–1715, and that fact immediately rouses keen interest, for those were stirring times. At the time when he was old enough to grasp what was happening and form some judgment on events, the rule of Cromwell, the sufferings of the Church, the overflowing seethe of dissent, were in full sway. Flirting with the idea of studying medicine, Tenison felt the call to serve the Church and was privately ordained. After the Restoration he served in various parishes till in 1680 he became vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Field. His promotion was rapid; in 1692 he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln, and in 1694 became Primate of all England. It fell to him to attend the hapless Monmouth from prison to the scaffold, and to preach Nell Gwynn's funeral sermon. It was he who led with counsels of good sense and moderation in the invitation to William of Orange, and to George of Hanover, and between the two to the Union of the English and Scots Parliaments. A sturdy Whig, he could not have been happy under the regime of Queen Anne, but

his position was too secure for him to suffer any loss of influence.

Dr. Carpenter has thus a field of vital interest to traverse, and he has done it brilliantly, and shed helpful light on many things. Thus readers north of the Tweed will learn that one difficulty felt in England as to the Union of 1707 was the ecclesiastical one—how could the Church of England countenance a Bill one of whose provisions was the continued Establishment of Presbyterianism, and a Presbyterianism which had not explicitly repudiated the Solemn League and Covenant, but had persecuted Episcopalians? Many other points might be mentioned. The chapters on the Popish menace or the ill-fated plan of 'Comprehension' for inducing dissenters to return to the Church are of special interest.

Tenison's other enterprises are duly set forth, how he founded a School, and was one of the founders of the S.P.G., and otherwise was a great servant of the Kingdom of God. And it is all so vividly set forth. W. D. NIVEN.

KERR LECTURE.

Those of us who keep an eye upon the output of theological literature in Scotland must be aware that while there has been a fair amount published in other departments there has been little in that of Church History, at any rate in its wider aspects. All the more welcome, then, is the appearance from the pen of the Rev. W. G. D. MacLennan, M.A., B.A., Minister of Bearsden North Church, of a volume on *Christian Obedience* (Nelson; 8s. 6d. net), being the Kerr Lecture for 1945, in which the subject is treated mainly from the historical standpoint, and as it has developed within the Christian Church.

Within the limitations imposed by a course of lectures Mr. MacLennan has given us a thoughtful and penetrating study of an important subject whose relevance to our present age is admirably brought out in the concluding section of the book. One is attracted by the classical purity of the style, by the balance and proportion of the treatment, by the sincerity of the expositions, and—not least—by the scrupulous modesty of the writer himself. And yet this last-named quality, which so often expresses itself in lengthy quotation (from H. H. Farmer, T. W. Manson, and others), betrays him almost as often into a certain lack of flow and consecution in style, with the result of distracting the reader from the course of the argument. Apart from this, we have nothing but praise for the book, and its attractiveness is enhanced for us by its stout loyalty to the Reformed faith and the devout sentiment that throbs and pulses beneath its lines.

A brief summary should show the scope of the work. In the Old Testament, speaking generally, obedience is obedience to a Sovereign. In the New Testament it is obedience to a Father. As such, it is a glad and true response to One whose whole desire is the welfare of His children, and who has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ His Son. Out of the urge for a more complete obedience to the Father as revealed in Christ the monastic system, with the Rule of St. Benet for its norm in the West, arose and spread in the ancient and mediæval Church. With the rise and growth of the ecclesiastical system in general there came, however, in the West, a change from obedience to Christ to obedience to the Pope (a change to which the decline of the monastic ideal was in no small measure due). In Jesuitism the long process of ecclesiastical obedience as obedience to God reached its apotheosis. Luther catching up again the Pauline gospel declared for the obedience of utter surrender in love and gratitude to God in Christ. Calvin stood also in the Pauline succession, though his Biblicism resulted in a later age in a new servitude to the written Word. As for Christian obedience to-day, it is no cloistered virtue, no ecclesiastical matter, but the opening of our minds and hearts to see the God and Father of us all at work everywhere in His world and offering to men His gifts freely; and not only so, it is the total response of our lives to that vision, in the spirit of the commandment of Christ in the days of His flesh.

'In Him,' as runs Mr. MacLennan's *confessio fidei*, 'I find all I need and all mankind needs for a right vision of the Power behind our world in the light of which we may learn to live aright.'

W. FULTON.

The Religion of Maturity, by John Wick Bowman, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in San Francisco Seminary, San Anselmo, California (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $3.00), is an attempt to answer the question, What is true religion? It is a workmanlike and competent study which shared the Abingdon-Cokesbury prize award of $7,500 for 1948. The author has had wide experience as a missionary and teacher, and his familiarity with New Testament problems and the contemporary Jewish literature is evident. He finds 'the religion of maturity' to be religion as revealed by Jesus, what Jesus took from His spiritual heritage, what He discarded of that heritage, and what He Himself contributed to it that was new. The book is divided into five parts, each of three chapters. Part I. deals with the Old Testament prophets. Parts II.–V. are studies of three religious movements or attitudes which followed upon prophecy and may be said to be attempts to give expression to prophetic ideals, namely, the religions of the altar (priestly-sacrificial), of the book (synagogue-scribal), and the throne (apocalyptic). Each of these laid exaggerated emphasis upon one element only of prophetic religion. What Jesus did was to build anew upon the prophets and to give to the world a revealed religion whose authority is the Incarnate Word, whose sole technique is the Spirit of Christ who guides His people in the Christian 'way' of life, and whose institution is the Body of Christ, an 'eternal' fellowship enjoyed within history. The book is well arranged, clear in style and argument, and well documented.

Bertrand Russell has given us still another book on philosophical problems, this time on epistemology—*Human Knowledge : Its Scope and Limits* (Allen & Unwin ; 18s. net). The distinguished author is advanced in years, but the characteristic features of his mind are quite unimpaired. Here we find the familiar brilliant literary style, the abundant illustration and the flashes of irrepressible wit. The one sign of age is a tendency to repetition. A good part of this book is just a rewriting of what the author has already said in his 'Enquiry into Truth and Meaning.' When years ago he left the field of mathematics and logic —where his work was epoch-making, and for which his reputation will be permanent—and took to philosophy there will be difference of opinion as to the wisdom of his choice. The very facility of his style perhaps betrays himself as well as his readers into a facility of judgment. He is sometimes too dogmatic, sometimes he seems to glide too easily away from the very knot he is trying to unravel. He describes his own philosophy as 'scientific common sense,' but while in this book he deals at considerable length with science, it may seem that he gives no adequate critique of common sense. And once or twice it is difficult to recognize either the science or the common sense. What can either make of this—'if my seeing of the sun is identical with the sun I see, then the sun I see is not the astronomer's sun.'

The Childhood of Jesus, by Magdalen Eldon and Frances Phipps (Collins ; 6s. net), is a lovely book, lovely physically in its make-up (the blue cover is a joy), but also in its contents. It tells the story very simply so that the youngest child can understand, and opposite each page is a full-page line-drawing which the child can fill in with paint. The pictures themselves are original and charming, and the letterpress nicely spaced out. At the end of the book there is a section for older children headed 'Questions' which is designed to stimulate the habit of 'looking-up.' It would be difficult to find any book on this subject as attractive. How it is produced at the moderate price is the publisher's secret.

Civilization and Religious Values (Allen & Unwin ; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D., F.S.A., Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, and Editor of 'The Modern Churchman,' consists of the Hibbert Lectures, four in number, delivered in the Universities of Cambridge, Manchester, and Bristol in the autumn of 1946. The Hibbert Lectures have mainly consisted of monographs on non-Christian religions or studies in the Christian Religion, and not a few notable works have appeared under this foundation. Dr. Major makes a modest claim for this work of his (which is not conceived on ambitious lines), but justly thinks that it is of topical value in view of the urgent need at the present time for the right understanding of the relations of religion to civilization.

After a discussion of the meaning of civilization and of religion respectively we are led to the topic of modern civilization's need of a religion which is suited to it. Such a religion should be a unifying force, evolving and creative, scientific, simple, attractive, and practical. Those qualities are not supplied by an anthropocentric humanism, but humanism need not be anthropocentric. It may be theistically conceived. And Christianity liberally interpreted stands for a theistic humanism corresponding to modern need. A central feature of this book is its exposition of Christianity on modern liberal lines, and the book ends with an exposition of the qualities that should characterize religious and Christian education. Dr. Major certainly brings his readers into touch with a great variety of opinions, old and new.

Methodists and non-Methodists alike will welcome *A Charge to Keep*, by the Rev. Frank Baker, B.A., B.D. (Epworth Press ; 8s. 6d. net), for it supplies a long-felt need. Never before has the attempt been made to tell within the covers of one book so much of the story of 'the people called Methodists'—their origin and development, their missionary expansion, their doctrines and organization, and their present-day activities. And right well has Mr. Baker succeeded in giving 'a bird's-eye view' of the many-sided life of the world family of Methodism, for there does not appear to be any relevant fact which his skilful hand has not woven into the pattern of his story. That so much could be compressed into so modest a space is verily a marvel, and yet, encyclopædic as the book is in its scope, the narrative never flags nor does it become clogged with a mass of detail. Mr. Baker, who is the Registrar of the Wesley Historical Society, has provided an index as complete as the most exacting critic could desire, and this, together with an equally extensive 'chronicle of main events,' makes it a reliable book of reference as well as a most readable account of denominational church history.

His Part and Ours (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 9s. 6d. net), by the Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter, Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh, an experienced writer on devotional themes, consists of a series of discourses, earnest and evangelical, steeped in Biblical thought and abounding in illustrative instance, gathering round the Scripture usage of the pronoun 'My.' The book was first published in 1937, and this is the third impression.

Studies in the Prophecy of Jeremiah, by the late Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. (Oliphants ; 12s. 6d. net), consists of thirty-three studies, arranged in roughly chronological order. Each chapter is headed by a Preparatory Reading or Readings, and the studies which follow are really sermons on texts taken (usually) from the Readings. Dr. Campbell Morgan is content to let the Bible interpret itself, and he takes little or no notice of the work of other expositors. Occasionally he slips on a matter of fact. Naturally in these printed pages something of the personality

f the author is lost, but sufficient remains for us be able to understand his fascination as a Bible positor.

The Solace of Shadowland (Pickering & Inglis; 6d. net), by Mr. R. D. Johnston, M.A., is a ume of comforting sermons intended princi- y for those who are downcast or in distress. ng with the text of each sermon are cited ted passages in prose or poetry from non- lical writers; in the selection of those passages author ranges widely. The style is simple and r, the treatment expository, the tone devout, the whole volume is an earnest summons to he faith and obedience of the Christian life. Not nly under the texts but in the course of the ermons themselves there is much citation of eligious poetry of the devotional kind. The author is a layman (a schoolmaster), but the book might well have come from the mature pen of a trained minister.

A book of real value, *A Guide to the Gospels*, by he Rev. W. Graham Scroggie, D.D., is published by Messrs. Pickering & Inglis (25s. net). It con- ains everything you want to know about the Gospels. It is designed for 'Colleges, Bible Schools, Bible Classes, and individual study,' and will (it may be hoped) find a welcome in all these quarters. It is divided into three parts: first, the Gospels viewed synthetically (including the historical and geographical background), the Synoptic problem, and also the character, authorship, date, inspiration in the case of each Gospel; second, the Gospels viewed analytically in four parts. Each Gospel is considered separately, its genuineness, sources, design, contents, with a detailed analysis; and third, the Gospels viewed christologically. This centres on Christ, all He was and did and suffered. There are four appendices: (1) Subjects, (2) Persons, (3) Bibliography (seven hundred names of books, arranged intelligently), and (4) Greek and other Foreign Words. There are eight maps. An immense amount of study has gone to the making of this book which is the fruit of years of labour. There is genuine scholarship in the book, and Dr. Scroggie has not confined his list of books in each category to orthodox writers. He mentions Bousset, Holtzmann, Renan, Strauss, and Schweitzer. Dr. Scroggie's own standpoint is orthodox, but by no means narrow, and readers will find here not only guidance on how to read the Gospels, but also material on which he may come to his own conclusions. We recommend the book strongly to all who desire to 'know their Bible' (Dr. Scroggie's aim), and to know how to value it.

Messrs. Skeffington have sent out a book of outline sermons which will be useful to many clergymen—*Addresses for To-Morrow*, by the Rev. Wilfrid Couch, M.A. (8s. 6d. net). The addresses were preached in a village church in Kent and are characterized by simplicity. They have been carefully studied, and, in spite of their brevity, they are the result of sound work. There is an outline for every Sunday in the Christian Year and for Saints' Days, as well as special provision for such an occasion as the Three Hours Service on Good Friday and for Holy Week. Honest clergymen are chary of anything like plagiarism, but they are always helped by finding an idea or suggestion which they can work out for themselves. And that is what they will get here. This is a helpful book.

'Amplius' (the word which Michael Angelo wrote over the work of his pupils) might have been the title of a book by the late Canon Stuart H. Clark, M.A., *God and the Universe* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). For its purpose is to give us a broad outlook on the development of truth about the relation of God to His universe. Canon Clark tries to show how God has reconciled the universe to Himself in every age. He tells the story of the universe from the Christian point of view, first the creation of the whole by God the Father, then the redemption by His Son, then the era of the Holy Spirit, followed by the extension of the Spirit's influence in the Church. The book is a Christian theodicy, written with a lively intelligence, original in its method, and from beginning to end inspiring because of the spiritual quality of the writer. It made a deep impression on one reader, both by its breadth of view and by the attractiveness of its exposition.

The Rev. S. L. Greenslade, M.A., Canon of Durham and Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in Durham University, has given us a book for which we are grateful—*The Church and the Social Order* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). It is a small book running to no more than a hundred and twenty-eight pages, but it is just packed with the kind of information the public requires, and, however compressed the matter, the style is never stilted. The author reviews in brief compass the social achievements of the gospel from the days of the Roman Empire to the present time. The five chapters deal respectively with the Early Church, the Early Middle Ages, the Later Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation, and the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries in England. The work is adequately 'documented' and provided with a full index. One hears so much criticism of the Church, so much of the Church's failure and as to her blindness to the social implications of the gospel, that one is tempted to believe that the critics are right. Canon Greenslade shows how far wrong they are. He is not unaware that the Church sometimes was tardy, as on the question of slavery. He sees how erroneous was the attempt merely to mitigate the results of social injustice by 'charity' and benevolence, instead of clamouring for social justice. But he shows, for example, how much was done, and done by Christian enterprise, in the 'dead' eighteenth century to establish hospitals, beneficent institutions, and schools. And he emphasizes how the Labour Movement in Britain sprang in a very real sense from the very bosom of the Church. Altogether it is a most helpful and illuminating book.

Freudian Psychology.

By Professor J. G. M'Kenzie, M.A., D.D., Nottingham.

The main theme of this and the following article is 'Freud and After.' Nevertheless I should not like any reader to infer that I am unmindful of the psychology before Freud. Yes, there was actually psychology before Freud, and recent psychologists are becoming aware that it cannot be neglected. I am always glad that my introduction to the subject was the metaphysics classroom, where neither reason nor the soul was an unwelcome guest in its own home.

M'Dougall's *An Introduction to Social Psychology* came out the year before I started my studies; and I can remember well the fascination with which I listened to my Professor expounding M'Dougall's catalogue of instincts as the sources of behaviour, in contrast to Bain's associationism and the academic account of perceptions being built up from sensations. M'Dougall's psychology, like Freud's, was a psychology of motivation in which the rational self had no place; whereas to the rationalistic psychology of those days any deviation from motivation by reason was either an abnormality or wickedness.

Nevertheless, we were not subjected to the absurd contradiction that psychology could be studied without reference to the self or soul, the subject of all experience that psychology studies. They did attempt to account for the moral control of what are now called 'drives' or instincts. They did not deny instincts, or what are now called sentiments; but they did contend that these could only solicit—they could not govern. The self was the supreme agent in control. They did believe that the self had a say (and it might be the final say) in its behaviour and development. When we get beyond Freud or M'Dougall we find that we have to fall back upon the self. After all, it is a self that breaks down, that suffers an anxiety neurosis, that cries to the psychiatrist to relieve it of its guilt and symptoms. We are not just a bundle of instincts; we are *besouled organisms*, as St. Thomas puts it.

Nothing that I have said in praise of the old emphasis on the soul need detract from the tremendous impetus that psychology as a science received from the genius of Freud. Beginning with the attempt to understand the peculiar symptoms of the hysteric, the grandiose delusions of the psychotic, the anxiety, the obsessive fears and the compulsive acts of the psycho-neurotic, Freud found the explanation in the unconscious and irrational elements in the make-up of personality. Along with Breuer, he was convinced that if he could make his patients recall the childish experiences which had been repressed and abreact the emotions these experiences generated the patient would lose his symptoms. Hypnotism was the first method employed to make the unconscious conscious. He soon found that not every patient could be hypnotized, and he devised his psycho-analytical technique of free association, in the belief that these associations would lead to the causes of the neuroticism. Free association is possible only on one condition, namely, that the patient will overcome the resistances of the moral inhibitions to the associations, and will pass no moral judgments on the 'wishes' or ideas he finds coming into consciousness. To the degree that these moral inhibitions and judgments are resisted the sooner will the free associations bring up the disturbing factors and the sooner will the symptoms disappear.

Hence the first contribution of Freud was to psychiatry rather than general psychology. His interest lay in psycho-pathology, in the finding of mental causes for mental disturbances. There can be no question to those familiar with pre-Freudian psycho-pathology about the revolution in psychiatry which the new methods and new concepts created. Practically all Schools of psychiatry and psychotherapy follow some form of psycho-analysis even when they differ strongly from the fundamental concepts of Freud.

Freud's interest in dreams arose because his patients complained of the terrifying nature of their dreams, and the anxiety and sweats with which these were accompanied. He came to the conclusion both by a study of patients' dreams and his own that the dream was a 'wish fulfilment,' and in neurotics this wish fulfilment was generally of a sexual nature. He believed that in sleep the repressing forces were somewhat in abeyance and the repressed wishes took their chance to reach consciousness. The distorted nature of dreams he accounted for on the hypothesis that the repressing forces were not altogether relaxed and, to evade the 'censor,' the latent motives were disguised by various dream mechanisms, such as symbols, condensation, displacement of accent and secondary elaboration. Thus the manifest content of the dream, *i.e.* the dream as remembered, had to be interpreted in order that the latent dream thoughts or wishes could be understood. To dreams he applied with great

success his method of free association. It was the associations that gave the meaning to the dream. Many of the symbols he found were common to all dreamers, especially those connected with sexual activity and the genitalia. His volume on dreams brought him almost at once into the forefront of investigators. To the end he believed that the dream, interpreted by free association, was 'the royal road to the unconscious.'

There were many, such as Jung and Rivers, who did not accept his idea that every dream could be interpreted as a 'wish fulfilment.' Rivers in his *Conflict and Dream* showed that many dreams were really an attempt to find a solution of a present problem and had no elements leading to repressed childish experiences. Jung found that many dreams showed not only the present conflict in the dreamer's mind but also revealed a way by which the self-development of the individual could take place. Nevertheless, none questioned the significance of the dream as a method of getting to know the hidden and unconscious factors active in the personality of the individual.

Freud made a purely scientific approach to the problems of behaviour and emotion. Behaviour was essentially something to be understood and not something to be morally appraised or blamed. Naturally this led him to formulate psychological concepts to explain the dynamics of behaviour. His psychology is essentially a psychology of motivation. It is his concepts and not his analytical technique which form the bone of contention between the psycho-analytical School and all other Schools of dynamic psychology.

The first of these concepts, as we have already hinted, was that of the 'unconscious.' His patients, he could see, were perfectly unaware of the motivations of their behaviour. Neither philosophers nor psychologists took kindly to the concept of unconscious ideas and wishes. They were already familiar with the idea of the unconscious in philosophy, and James had familiarized them with the subconscious and the co-conscious of Morton Prince. Freud's conception was entirely different. Ideas and wishes of which the individual was entirely unaware were determining his behaviour —and especially his abnormal traits. The fruitfulness of the concept is witnessed to by the help it has given in the understanding of both normal and morbid processes. Freud showed in his *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* that slips of the tongue, forgetfulness (which is different from the normal process of forgetting), errors in thought, speech, and action, are not chance occurrences but motivated by the unconscious.

From all this Freud deduced that psychic processes are determined and that these determine our behaviour. His logic here is doubtful. It is true that our psychic processes are determined, and that the behaviour of the neurotic and psychotic is also determined is probably true. But we cannot infer from that, as Freud does, that conscious process cannot influence either psychic process or behaviour. When Freud speaks of psychic processes as being determined he means that they are determined by the past from the unconscious. The Gestalt School is nearer the truth in its assertion that at any given moment the past or early habits are just one factor in a large system of forces and that individual behaviour may be determined by goals whose realization lies in the future. Freud's psychological determinism goes on the assumption that consciousness is always under the control of the unconscious. But, as John MacMurray [1] has pointed out, this places the analyst in the dilemma that if his theory is true his practice must be impossible, for the whole purpose of the practice is to bring the unconscious under the control of the conscious. Unless that is the aim of the practice there would be no sense in undertaking an analysis.

Nevertheless, the criticisms that can be brought against Freud's doctrine of psychological determinism do not logically detract from his findings that unconscious forces are at work as factors in our conscious behaviour. That they determine neurotic symptoms, such as irrational phobias, compulsive acts like the washing of the hands to get rid of the sense of guilt, or obsessive thoughts, no psychologist who has had experience of clinical work could possibly deny. Freud was right in claiming that we cannot help what comes into our minds; but he failed to realize that what we shall do with what comes into our mind can be determined, and is determined, by processes other than unconscious ones.

If his concept of the unconscious was at first unacceptable to many, that of 'repression' has created a good deal of confusion. Even to-day there are many thinkers who seem unable to differentiate it from 'suppression' or 'self-control.' Freud's own definition is perfectly clear: 'The essence of repression lies simply in the function of rejecting and keeping something out of consciousness.' Dr. David Yellowlees gives the simplified definition that repression is a refusal to see something, not a refusal to do something. Dr. Rivers spoke of 'unwitting' and 'witting repression.' We are all familiar with the process of trying to keep out of consciousness some conscious worry because it is distracting our attention: this is 'witting repression' according to Rivers. In time the witting repression becomes automatic and unconscious, and thus 'unwitting.'

Two questions arose for Freud from the facts of

[1] *The Boundaries of Science*, 176 f.

the unconscious wish, idea, or emotion, and the process of repression by which they were made unconscious: (1) What is it that we repress? (2) Why do we repress? The answer to the first question is, 'some form of infantile sexuality' or incipient incestuous wish formed during the Œdipus period of childhood, *i.e.* during the early years when the attachment of the boy to the mother and the girl to the father is very close. In his later thought Freud recognized the presence of hostile wishes aroused and repressed during the oral stage if for any reason the child found difficulty in taking its feed; or at the anal stage when the child is being taught habits of cleanliness; or at the genital stage when he becomes interested in the pleasure derived from his own body. Any frustration of sexual libido could arouse hostility. The answer to the second question is that repressed wishes or emotions are contrary to the prohibitions of the 'super-ego,' and unacceptable to the conscious moral image or 'ego-ideal' which the individual must live up to, and which he is expected to live up to by parents, teachers, and society.

None of the psycho-analytic doctrines aroused more opposition than that of 'infantile sexuality.' What is called the 'Personal Unconscious,' *i.e.* the strivings, ideas, impulses, and emotions repressed in experience, was for Freud nothing but the product of the tensions created by infantile sexuality and aggression. All failure to adjust to reality, all abnormality of behaviour, as well as simple maladjustment have their roots here. Hence the necessity for 'deep analysis' or 'depth psychology' if a cure was to be effected.

It was on this doctrine that Jung and Adler broke away from Freud. Jung believed that every break-down was due to failure to meet a present problem; it was a present situation that had to be analysed and faced and not simply a sexual problem which had its roots in childish experience. He refused to accept the Freudian concept of sexual libido as the dominating urge of life as too narrow. Libido to Jung is the general conational endeavour of the personality as a whole, and energizes all our interests and not merely the sexual. Adler, on the other hand, paid little attention to the unconscious, and for him sexual difficulties were secondary. He emphasized the aggressive impulses and thought that we are all dominated by the 'will to power,' so that any frustration of that, such as some inferiority, could give rise to the failure to adjust to life. Jung believes that the differences between himself and Freud go back to basic assumptions, and unlike both Adler and Freud, he refuses to believe that man can be explained in terms of one fundamental urge. He does not doubt that there are individuals who can be explained in terms of Freudian or Adlerian psychology; there are people with infantile sexual left-overs and those who can be explained by the struggle for superiority, but he refuses to see normal man as necessarily dominated by either. To Jung the conflict is between biological needs and the drive for the realization of the spirit; and instead of seeing religion as an illusion, as Freud does, he sees it as the way man has always used to lessen as well as to resolve the conflicts which disturb his soul. It is from Freud's doctrine of human nature that Jung[1] departs radically, rather than from his psychiatric findings. Freud never really learned to differentiate between his observation of fact and his theory of facts; and, as these facts were almost wholly drawn from the observation of pathological cases, his doctrine of human nature was bound to be inadequate if not wholly false.

Freud was not content with the revolution he had created in psychiatry; he applied his findings to art, sociology, and anthropology as well as religion. Man was a creature of instinct; reason when not engaged in finding *rationalisations* for instinctive activities was no more than an instrument in the service of instinctive satisfactions. His morality consisted in restraining his sexuality and aggressiveness within the bounds of the conventional moral ideas of society. He was moved entirely by the 'Pleasure principle' and only restrained by the 'Reality principle,' which really represented what society tabooed.

Nevertheless, Freud was compelled to observe the deep sense of guilt experienced both by his patients and man in general. That hinted at something moral behind repression. For long his attention had been almost entirely directed to what had been repressed and not to the repressing forces. He had no doctrine of the self, or of the influence of culture—the individual being no more than the field of conflicting tendencies. He attempted to remedy this by his volume, *The Ego and the Id*, and *Civilisation and its Discontents*. He divided the self into three: There was first the ego, which had the attribute of perceptive consciousness and was the medium between the unconscious instinctive tensions and the external situation in which the tensions could be relieved. Then there was the id, the unconscious structure from which the ego had been formed—the ego being the amount of the unconscious that had become conscious—and the source of all our drives. Finally, there was the super-ego which was the introjected prohibitions of parents, teachers and society; it also carried the ego-ideal, or the image of what we were expected to be morally by society.

[1] *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, ch. 6: 'Freud and Jung-Contrasts.'

his ego-ideal Freud rooted in narcissistic self-love. This was Freud's substitute for conscience. It was the threats of this super-ego which compelled the ego to refuse entrance to the conscious of offending tendencies; he that created the self-punishments and guilt for instinctual wishes and acts which were contrary to the ego-ideal, in the form of neurotic symptoms. Under his threats the individual felt insecure, and his need to be free from this sense of guilt and to feel secure, in spite of the demands of the id, made him project the idea of a God who would take the place of the loving father of infancy before the Œdipus complex had disrupted the relations between father and child. Religion was thus a 'benignant neurosis'! The longing to be reconciled to God was simply the longing to be reconciled to the father hated during the Œdipus period. Thus we reach the position that both morality and religion, considered to be man's highest achievements, are rooted in pathological processes. For Freud there was no moral, religious or aesthetic nature in man, for the appreciation of beauty was derived 'from the realms of sexual sensation.' What seems to us 'good' is no more than the sublimation of sexual tendencies. Instinctive activities can become 'aim-inhibited,' or attached to ends socially acceptable; by this means they are able to avoid the condemnation of the super-ego and elude the 'censor'; their conformity to social ideals makes them 'good.' The inadequacy of this analysis of the personality is obvious to every one but members of the Psychoanalytic School. As a description of the psychotic and neurotic personality it is true; for the fundamental defect of the psychotic and neurotic is that the self—what Jung calls the spirit—has never come to birth. Freud accounts for the divided personality, but he has no explanation to give of the unified personality.

Much the same criticism can be passed on his attempt to account for morality and the higher nature of man by the ego-ideal and the super-ego. It is perfectly true that the neurotic is dominated by a prohibitive conscience, and that not a few religious people were driven to religion by a morbid sense of guilt and a mere wish to feel secure amid the storms of life. As Jung has remarked, 'Freud's idea of the *super-ego* is a furtive attempt to smuggle in his time-honoured image of Jehovah in the dress of psychological theory.' The fact that he has to account for man's morality and religion shows that he considers them at least a 'functional necessity,' which he actually does admit. Can anything be a functional necessity unless it is rooted somewhere in truth and reality?

Freud's genius did not lie in philosophical capacity, nor indeed in making a contribution to general psychology. If he made a contribution here at all, it was in showing that the unity of the personality is not a mathematical unity but a dynamic unity; but that contribution is by implication and not by explicit studies of the nature of the self. In the realm of abnormal personality his contribution is supreme, even though both his method and concepts have had to be modified. How inadequate his psychology is, and how great are the gaps he left, will be seen as we outline the psychology 'After Freud.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Would You Be a Witness?

By the Reverend T. E. Edmond, M.A.,
Little Heath, Herts.

'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.'—1 Jn 1[3].

I have always had a dread of being involved in a street accident. I was the other day! I saw it coming too! I arrived one afternoon at a London station and got on a bus for the long journey home. I thought it would be more interesting to get a good seat on top right up at the front. The bus turned a corner rather too fast, I thought, and made for a crowded bus stop. Evidently the driver thought the same as I did, and put on his brakes hard; but the road was wet and the bus skidded right across the road and went straight into the back of a taxi. The poor old cab got a nasty knock. However, nobody was hurt.

Immediately the road was full of people—policemen with note-books, the angry taxi-man pointing to his battered cab, all the passengers from the bus except me. I had a nice view from my top seat, and decided to stay quiet until the conductor decided what to do. But to my surprise up the stairs he came and made straight for me! He said, 'Will you be a witness, sir?'

Now I thought at once of magistrates' courts and lawyers in wigs. I pictured myself in a busy life hanging about waiting endlessly for the case to come on. I was just about to say in an off-hand sort of way 'No, thank you, not me!' when I thought to myself, you'd better be careful and think what you are saying. That's rather an important question to answer—'Will you be a witness?'

So, before I answered, I asked the conductor what I should have to do. He replied, 'Oh, just say what you saw.' So I at once said, 'Yes, I will be a witness.'

You must be a witness. The future of England depends on your being faithful witnesses. You probably may never preach a sermon; but you can all bear your witness. You can tell others the story of what you know to be true. You can speak of Jesus and His love. That might be more valuable than many sermons. A faithful servant once told the great Earl of Shaftesbury what she knew about Jesus. It altered the whole of his life. He dedicated his gifts to the service of God and his fellows.

'Whereas once I was blind, now I see.' That was the witness that a blind man once gave, when they asked him about Jesus who had healed him. He said he could not argue, he could only tell them what he knew to be true. Or as St. John wrote—'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.'

The world does not want more clever people. It needs more faithful witnesses. It wants more who will bear their witness to the things they know and believe to be true. It needs those who will have the courage to tell the truth, and just say what they have seen for themselves.

Oh could I tell, ye surely would believe it!
Oh could I only say what I have seen!
How should I tell or how can ye receive it,
How, till He bringeth you where I have been?

The Christian Year.

SEXAGESIMA.

Samuel Two, Double Fourteen.

BY THE REVEREND R. J. WEDDERSPOON, M.A., CHEAM, SURREY.

'For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect any person: yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him.'—2 S 14^{14}.

This is a verse of Scripture that deeply impressed Rudyard Kipling. At any rate, he makes it the pivot on which one of his most moving, and, as Ellis Roberts says, most Christian, short stories turns. 'It is to some of us as a fragment from a modern Divina Commedia.'

> Our lives, our tears, as water,
> Are spilled upon the ground:
> God giveth no man quarter,
> Yet God a means hath found,
> Though faith and hope have vanished,
> And even love grows dim. . . .
> A means whereby His banished
> Be not expelled from Him.

In this famous story, *On the Gate*, Kipling represents St. Peter being faced by a traitor of the first War. He is reluctant to turn him completely away, and he asks those around him for a ruling, being unable himself to recall any 'precise ruling' that might cover such a case. The answer came: the wise woman of Tekoah. 'You have it!' Peter cried. 'Samuel Two, Double Fourteen. To think that *I* should have forgotten!' 'For we must needs die and are as water spilled on the ground which cannot be gathered up again. Neither doth God respect any person, *yet*. . . .'

To think that we should forget! 'Yet doth he devise means.' You will remember that the wise woman of Tekoah is pleading with David for the restoration of Absalom. Absalom had been banished in disgrace, and Joab secured the services of the wise woman to state an imaginary case of her own, similar in type, in order that David might be induced to see that Absalom must be brought back and full reconciliation made. Whenever, therefore, we are recalled to the story of the wise woman of Tekoah we are immediately reminded of the magnificence of the work of reconciliation. Life is short, she pleads, and if death comes, as it may come soon either to David or to Absalom, for God is no respecter of persons, then it will be too late. 'Bring Absalom back from Geshur,' is her demand. Restore him to the royal favour. Cancel the decree of banishment. Reinstate him in the home. Absalom was indeed restored, and the plea of the wise woman was not made in vain.

Now any story that tells us about the necessity of reconciliation is casting light upon the operations of God: the voice of the reconciler is the voice of God. What is the history of God in His dealings with men but the history of reconciliation? Is not the greatest Christian doctrine the doctrine of reconciliation? Is not the greatest gospel any man can be called upon to preach the gospel of reconciliation? There is no limit to the scope of this gospel. Beginning with the knowledge that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, and assured that the Cross stands to the end of time as the pledge and guarantee of that reconciliation, we must surely recognize that our most urgent and clamant duty is to send waves of reconciliation to ocean's farthest shore. 'As God hath for Christ's sake forgiven you, so also. . . .' That is the burden of the preacher's message in every age.

One is sometimes staggered and appalled by the amount of propagandist teaching in the world, delivered with intensity and charged with passion that rests upon a basis of hatred and bitterness, and not upon the wholesome and fragrant foundation of desire to reconcile. It is always easy to inflame passion. Words of vituperation and invective slip easily over many tongues, and for many they possess a strange attraction, but it is the ministry of healing employing a diction that is calm, restrained, and mollifying, that keeps the world on its course and clears the way for Christ. O wise woman of Tekoah!

Listen to her argument. Is it any less effective now? First she reminds us that death has a way of catching us unawares. 'For we must needs die and are as water spilt upon the ground that cannot be gathered up again.' Said Edmund Burke on a famous occasion when an opponent of his had died during an election, 'What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue!' It is a healthy occupation sometimes for us to stop and consider just how our major interests look against the background of eternity. Brethren, the time is short

hat is a commanding word in Scripture. It is rtainly too short for the hoarding of grudges d the hugging of resentments. It is certainly o short to delay the exercise of the ministry of e reconciling hand.

Sometimes the awareness of the shortness of me comes suddenly, and may have startling sults. J. B. Priestley in *They Walk in the City* scribes Rose Salter, one of his characters in the ory. 'She herself and all the people round her d been going to live for ever. Now she realized at all these people down there on the pavements, aring at the shop-windows, meeting and laughing nd talking, were dying. . . . She was given a limpse of the vast, tragic spectacle of life.' That as the revelation that came to a young woman. tated as the novelist puts it, there may be a uggestion of the morbid, but surely we do require o be awakened to a sense of the 'vast, tragic pectacle of life' somehow or other if only that we ay be urged to give ourselves to some worthwhile econciling task without delay. One of Schweitzer's easons for going to Equatorial Africa was that he ight help to atone to the black man for all the rongs that the white man had done him. If we re cast in less heroic mould at any rate there are he lesser duties of the reconciler awaiting us vherever we may be.

He drew a circle that shut me out,
Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.
But love and I had the wit to win—
We drew a circle that took him in.

That surely is the Christian task.

But the wise woman had a further argument. Think of God, she said. 'Yet doth he devise means that his banished be not expelled from him!' Here the New Testament peeps out through the Old. It is not the will of God that there should be perpetual estrangement. The banished are welcomed back. With our New Testaments in our hand we know exactly what means the Father took. Had these means never been employed we can only dimly imagine what our plight to-day might have been. Deduct from the pages of history the gracious, reconciling influence of the spirit of Christ, so often encountered when least recognized, and the record would be infinitely sad. There has never been lacking what H. R. Mackintosh called 'the Divine Initiative,' and it is in constant operation.

So very often it is the way of man to say: he has made his bed, and he can just lie on it. But it is never the way of the Father. No wonder that Kipling in this great story portrays St. Peter as reluctant to turn away even the traitor. He fell back upon his own experience after his denial. 'Samuel Two, Double Fourteen.' 'To think that I should have forgotten!'

In our more impatient moments, of course, we imagine that the means God employs should be even more spectacular. We think that God is as impatient as we are, forgetting that He has been extremely patient with ourselves! Leslie Weatherhead talks somewhere of the man who said to him, 'If I were God I would not stand the indifference of the present generation. I'd jolly well stir them up, and let them know I was God. I'd put a brass plate on the door, and send a few angels around.' That is a common and oft-expressed desire, but God has devised His own means, and it has a strangely effective influence still. In other words, we are brought back to the Cross, and its ever-increasing power of appeal. If it holds us in thrall, then we must see to it that others too are made to know its vivifying power.

The only thing that matters to-day is the new evangelism. What method is going to be most effective in our materialistic and cynical age there is no one who can yet say. It is already apparent, however, that in all branches of the Church there is a 'concern,' a willingness to devise means that is the authentic guarantee of the Spirit's leading. For, whatever happens, the Church cannot rest content with its services and worship, its praise and its prayer. It longs for the restoration of the banished, the extension of the fellowship, and the completion of the family. It disregards at its peril the wise woman of Tekoah.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

Discarded Habit.

BY THE VERY REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, D.D.,
THE COLLEGE, MILLPORT.

'And he, casting away his garment, sprang up, and came to Jesus.'—Mk 10^{50} (R.V.).

But for his blindness it is unlikely that Bartimæus would have sat by the roadside begging. His cloak symbolized his occupation. It was a wrap that would have been unnecessary for one leading a more active life, and it marked him out. But one day, while he was living that existence that was but the shadow of a life and plying his shadow trade, something happened. Jesus of Nazareth came into that life and changed it. Yes, but He did not stride into it and take the destiny of Bartimæus out of his hands. Jesus never forced Himself into any man's life uninvited. Bartimæus heard that there was a stir and a tumult. Something was going on, a crowd had gathered, and when he asked one of the crowd for an explanation he was told that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. That was all that it meant to the crowd at the time, probably all that it ever meant to most of them, if indeed they remembered it at all in later years.

But to Bartimæus the passing of Jesus of Nazareth meant a great deal more than that. For him it was a great opportunity to be seized there and then or not at all. He had not much to go on, just that little piece of information from the man in the crowd, that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by, and perhaps some half-remembered rumour that this was a prophet who had worked some surprising miracles. That was all, and when Bartimæus determined to do something about it he got little enough help from the crowd on whose charity he lived. The crowd had no ill will at him, and just why they should have rebuked him and told him to be quiet when he raised his voice and

called out we do not know. It was just the sort of unkind action of which a crowd of decent, well-meaning people can be quite capable, and then be surprised at themselves afterwards for having done such a thing.

Bartimæus, however, was not to be held back. He had made up his mind and cried out the louder. 'Thou son of David, have mercy on me.' It sounded like the usual beggar's cry for alms, and perhaps that was why the crowd objected; it would spoil the procession if a halt had to be made every time a beggar called out for charity. But the matter was taken out of the hands of the crowd. The procession came to a standstill, and Jesus called to Bartimæus. A moment ago the crowd had been making it difficult for him to get to Jesus. Now that difficulty had been overcome, but it seemed as though his own cloak might trip him up. He dared not risk that, so he threw it away and pressed forward to Jesus asking Him, not for money, which any one else could have given him, but for the restoration of his sight, which no one else could have given him. Jesus of Nazareth was passing by, but Bartimæus would not suffer Him to pass until he had made his great request and had it granted. A mighty work had been wrought in him, and now he entered into a new life and followed Jesus, glorifying God.

And the right hand of the Lord still brings mighty things to pass. There are moments in our lives when Jesus of Nazareth passes by. Are we going to suffer Him to pass, or are we going to let Him do great things for us, dispelling our blindness and renewing our lives? It is an urgent and important question, because the lives of many of us are but shadow lives, lives of blindness and beggary. How many of us are living at the mercy of the crowd, accepting its standards of right and wrong, acclaiming its verdicts, no matter how superficial, pleased with ourselves if we are no worse than our neighbours, and transported with pride if they think well of us! Because of his infirmity Bartimæus had to rely on the eyes of the crowd, and so we cannot ignore the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of mankind, but in the matters that affect our eternal welfare we must act for ourselves and act decisively. The crowd will do no more for us in bringing us to Jesus than it did for Bartimæus. Almost certainly it will place difficulties in our way as it placed them in the way of Bartimæus. But if we realize that the dispelling of our blindness and the renewal of our lives is at stake shall we be content to obey the crowd? Had Bartimæus done that he would have remained blind to the end of his days. For him there would have been no renewal of life and he would have been Bartimæus the beggar as long as he lived. And he would never have known what he had missed, might perhaps even have forgotten altogether how near Jesus of Nazareth had once been to him.

But it is not only the crowd that can make difficulties. We may, like Bartimæus, have some cloak to trip us up, some garment that it would be wise to cast away, for habit sometimes means a way of dressing, as when we speak of a monk's habit or a riding habit, sometimes a way of living as when we speak of good and bad habits. So we may think of our habits as the garments of our souls. It was probably something of a wrench for Bartimæus to part with his beggar's mantle. He had grown used to it and found it comfortable. Probably, we say, when speaking of the cloak, but we may be quite certain that the old life symbolized by the beggar's mantle could not be left behind without some effort. Though it had always been an unsatisfying life, a crippled life, he had become accustomed to it, and it had its comforts and its compensations. Now he had to face a new life with new responsibilities which were a little terrifying at first.

So it is with us. The cloak which was appropriate enough for the beggar sitting by the roadside and living at the mercy of the crowd is no longer fitting wear for one who has looked on Jesus of Nazareth and means to follow Him. The habits, the ways of life which were natural to our shadow existence are no longer seemly for those who have passed from darkness into light.

When our Lord restored sight to Bartimæus He was on His last journey to Jerusalem. Of course Bartimæus did not know that, and when we read that he followed Him we wonder whether he followed all the way. But if we can only wonder about Bartimæus we can be sure that we are committed to following all the way, to Gethsemane and to Calvary, and for that journey we must gird ourselves. There are many things that we do not see clearly, many things that puzzle us. But note that it was not after but before he received his sight that Bartimæus cast away his garment. Otherwise he might never have come face to face with Jesus. So with us it may be some habit that is impeding our approach, some way of life that we must abandon before we dare ask for the gift of sight. Let us remember this as we enter the holy season of Lent. Let us remember that *asceticism* comes from a Greek word that was originally used of athletes going into training, and then let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith.

First Sunday in Lent.

Ordeal of Temptation.

By the Reverend John L. Riach, B.D., Edinburgh.

'What profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun? One generation passeth away . . . for ever.'—Ec $1^{3, 4}$.

Although Martin Luther dubbed the Epistle of James a letter of straw, Foxe informs us that in his day a poor farmer was known to give away a load of hay he could ill afford for a copy of that very document. This reveals that in the undoubted lesser works of the Bible God speaks to men, and that the writers have some sappy things to say despite the limitations of their work. This is the case with Ecclesiastes. Granted, this book

is not in the same category as the prophecy of the saintly Jeremiah or some of the Psalms. How could it be when its author was cynical, pessimistic, and lacking in the deep faith of the truly religious Jew? Yet, despite its glaring limitations this writer has some pertinent things to declare to men, the most startling of which is that the volume of evil in this world never declines no matter how men fight it.

When the last slave in the British Empire was set free, one of the statesmen of the day, who had fought for its obliteration, sighed with relief, and said, 'Slavery gone! Thank God! That makes the world a cleaner place.' But did it? The common notion abroad is that if some crying evil is eliminated from the earth or some good promoted, then, of course, by the laws of simple arithmetic, the volume of evil in the world becomes less. But the extraordinary thing this man has to announce is that it does nothing of the kind. Evil somehow defies all the narrow laws of arithmetic. No matter what good is done or what particular evil is eradicated the mystery is that the sum total of evil in the world remains unaltered. Look at the thousands of rivers in spate pouring their torrents of brown and silver into the sea, year in, year out! One would expect the sea to get fuller and fuller, yet the volume of the ocean does not alter a bit. By a mysterious process what the rivers give is returned to their sources and all their efforts to fill the sea and alter its volume, fail. It is likewise with evil. Here is a generation that sees a mighty social evil, so it rises up against it and, in the process of time, eliminates it. Here is another which sees some good thing to institute, and does so, yet with all the efforts of succeeding generations the amount of evil in the world, like the volume of the sea, never changes. One generation passeth away and another cometh, but the earth, this solid, crass, wicked earth, abideth for ever.

When we begin to question this astounding assertion we discover that it is no false and windy rhetoric, but true. For one thing, we find that as good increases in the world, it is balanced by a corresponding increase in evil. Who can deny that science has brought to mankind untold boons, in comforts for the home, drugs, and a hundred cures, yet, at the same time, it has increased the brutality and inhumanity of man to his fellow-man. While giving benefits with the one hand it has given corresponding curses with the other. And for another thing, we discover that when any specific evil is rooted out of the world another unforeseen evil springs up and takes its place, or as Niebuhr puts it, 'the justice of to-day becomes the injustice of to-morrow.' The writer of Ecclesiastes is perfectly right. The evil of the world may change in form but it never alters in volume. 'One generation passeth away, and another cometh: but the earth abideth for ever.'

The effect of this truth on all of us Christian people can be disastrous once it dawns upon us. We are called to an incessant warfare against evil. We are summoned to allow God to sweep into our lives with His redeeming grace and recreate our whole nature. We are told not to stand aloof from the world with its coarse prize fights, its problems and social evils, as many of us would like to do, but to do battle with these things. If the amount of evil in the world, however, never grows any less despite all our efforts, does it not seem as futile as were all Hercules' attempts to clean the Augean stable? That was the effect of this truth on the writer of Ecclesiastes, for 'what profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?' he asks. What is the use of fighting against evil if the volume of it grows no less with all our passionate efforts? None, absolutely none!

That is precisely the effect we Christians must not allow this truth to have on us; nor will we, if we have the insight to see three things in brief.

(*a*) We shall fight evil even if its volume never decreases if we see it as God sees it. The Roman Catholic Church has ventured to define a just war as one where there is a reasonable prospect of success. We should never dare fly to arms unless we are fairly sure to be on the winning side. But is this the calculating, prudential attitude we should take to evil? Must we never strike out at it unless we are certain that we are going to obliterate it? Surely never, if we catch a vision of evil as God sees it. In a Broadcast on Arnold of Rugby, a former pupil told how when he was a boy at that famous seat of learning, a certain lad had committed a grave offence which was punishable by expulsion. When news of the wrong was communicated to Arnold, this narrator happened to catch a sight of Arnold's face as he walked along the corridor to deal with the culprit. 'For the first time in my life,' he declared, 'I saw what evil means to God.' What that means is described best of all by Habakkuk when he says that God is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. He just cannot stand the sight of it. And when evil means that to you and me; when we cannot tolerate the sight of it, then it matters not if we are not successful against it. We must strike out, viciously, at it.

(*b*) Even though the volume of evil never grows any less we shall keep fighting it if we see that if we do not, then we shall become its victims. When Temple Gairdner was in Cairo he confesses that the city had an evil, sinister atmosphere which could not be defined, but only felt. Saint though he was he knew that, unless he kept resisting the evil environment, he would succumb to it. That is the aggressive character of evil. It has no pacifist tendencies. If we will not take to arms, it despises our neutrality and will attack us as Peter points out when he speaks of the devil as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. If we will not fight injustice then we become the victims of injustice. If we will not fight worldliness then we degenerate into pathetic worldlings. If the evils of the world mean nothing to us and we raise no finger against them then we become tinged with every one of them. For Vinet was even more right than he thought when he said, 'an evil system has for its accomplices every one who spares it.'

(*c*) And, third, even though the volume of evil in the world never grows any less we shall never give up fighting it to the last ditch if we see that such constant battling against evil is not in vain. What if, when we get rid of one injustice, another takes its place? Such a victory is not lost. It is caught up by God and will be preserved in His Kingdom when it is established at the end of history. And not only that, but in this battling with evil which never comes to an end as long as history lasts, we are being equipped to become citizens of that Kingdom. During a seventy-mile per hour gale, if one looks heavenwards, he may see against the scudding clouds of quaker grey, a frail gull, weighing only a few ounces, being hurled towards a church steeple. When doom seems inevitable, what does the bird do but wheel suddenly, and, facing its foe, with a deft flick of its wings uses the force that would destroy it to soar higher and even advance against it. That is the miracle God can work. In His providence He can take the evil of the world and use it to bring forth good; and it is through setting us Christians to a constant battle with the evil of the world from which there is no discharge, that He equips us for the high destiny of belonging to His Kingdom. For have any of us pride enough to believe we have such a qualification as we are?

How paradoxical is this great Christian faith of ours. It must be, for it is too profound to be fully grasped and defined by the intellect of mortal man. There is no more pertinent paradox in the whole of Christianity for us who have been called to it, than this; that the evil of the world, while it changes in form, never alters in volume, despite all our efforts, yet we have to enter into unending warfare upon it. It may be true that one generation passeth away, and another cometh: but the earth abideth for ever; but because of that do not, like the writer of Ecclesiastes, give up the struggle against evil in despair, saying, 'what profit hath a man of all his labour?' Rather side with a far greater soul than the preacher of Ecclesiastes, Paul, who told the Ephesians that he was wrestling with principalities, powers, and spiritual wickedness, and continued to do so right up to the end, so that he could say to Timothy on the eve of his death, 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.'

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

A Faith Commended by Christ.

BY THE REVEREND A. W. McCLYMONT, D.LITT., EDINBURGH.

'When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'—Lk 7^{9}.

These are undoubtedly words of the highest commendation.

First of all we notice that here is a man whose sympathies and interests passed beyond the bounds of *class and occupation*. His servant was ill, and it is always an inconvenience when one who should do the waiting has to be waited upon; and for some people it is more than an inconvenience, it is an annoyance and an irritation. But in the case of this master, there was nothing whatever of such feelings. The servant was ill, seriously ill, and the whole thought of his master was concerned with this distressing situation. The lad was most probably a slave, in the opinion of the day a mere chattel, part of the domestic furniture and equipment. There is a document which scholars believe to be the will of the Greek philosopher, Plato, a beautiful and high-minded writer, and in that document he makes arrangement for the disposal of his estate after his death. Certain of the slaves are to be set free. Others, 'also the household furniture,' are to be transferred to friends and relatives mentioned in the document.

Christianity did not at one blow strike the fetters from the slave, but it abolished the idea of any man born in the image of God being a mere chattel, and established his right as a unique personality. Paul in that beautiful little letter to Philemon writes of the runaway slave Onesimus and bids Philemon receive him as 'not now a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved. . . . If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself.' Only after many long years was the Christian teaching to prevail and find expression in the laws of every country that esteemed itself civilized. And yet here was this Roman soldier, raised above the institutions and standards of his time, deeply and anxiously concerned with the slave who was dear to him.

In the second place we notice how the sympathies and interests of this man passed beyond the boundaries of *race and nationality*. It was said of him 'he loveth our nation,' and this nation the Jews. The Jews have never been a beloved nation. Individual members of that race we have come to know and esteem, but we have forgotten that they were Jews. As a nation they have suffered as scarce any other people the scorn and detestation of mankind. The reasons for this lamentable state of affairs we need not discuss. What is important is to note that the Roman captain had a spirit which soared beyond all the petty rancours, antipathies and spite of races and peoples, 'he loveth our nation.' He had a vision and a sympathy which rebuke our limited faith, and if our Lord were to look round the world to-day, might He not once again declare, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'

And yet the spirit of nationality may be fruitful of much good, a blessing as well as a curse. In the fourteenth century there occurred the break up of the Holy Roman Empire and the beginning of the development of Europe into separate nations. There is no doubt that with such a development came much that was precious, a burgeoning of the human spirit in a variety of expressions, in art and music and literature and social organization. And beyond Europe to-day may be witnessed the rise of a new national consciousness, which adds to the problems of statesmen for the time being, but ultimately may

contribute to the spiritual wealth of the world. One favourable sign is the growth of national churches in China, India, and elsewhere, with a sense of responsibility to their own people and a desire to equip themselves with the powers of mind and soul which will enable them to serve as acceptable messengers of the Word. Our prayers must assuredly be quick and active for the increase of such a spirit, for it lies in the line of the faith that Christ commends.

Once again we pay homage to another quality in the character of the centurion. His sympathies and interests passed beyond the limits of ordinary *social duty and civic responsibilities*. It was said of him, 'he hath built us a synagogue.'

Consider that here was a man whose special duty was to keep the peace in the community over which he was set. He might well have said to himself, 'I shall see that people are able to go about their lawful business in safety, that human life is protected and the homes of the people are secure from molestation or attack, and when I have done that my task is discharged and my duty accomplished.' But this soldier confessed by his noble action that 'man does not live by bread alone.' He believed that human life is incomplete and its energies undeveloped where there is no place for communion with the Eternal, no review of our plans and our achievements in the light of a Divine will and purpose, no confession and cleansing, no fresh renewal of our better instincts and resolves.

We hear much to-day about the need of training in citizenship, in the sense of social responsibility, the duties of courtesy and of service, and may such efforts be attended with all success. To be content with a limitation of effort like this is, however, to be satisfied too soon, to mistake a useful method and a useful aim for the higher influences that shape our aims and inspire all worthy methods. The creed of a 'dialectical materialism,' as it is called, has captivated the minds of many. They have seen the power of the machine and the influence of outward forces upon the character and conditions of human life. The historians to-day acknowledge more freely the sweep and potency of these circumstances in the material world. But just because the bonds are more visible, the search for freedom becomes more acute. If men are to be more than tools, they need to cherish a life beyond even the high levels of social duty and civic responsibility. The ideal of 'the good citizen' is no substitute for the discipline and inspiration of the Church.

But perhaps most remarkable of all the remarkable features of the faith and character of the centurion was *his acceptance of Christ as his supreme authority*. 'Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.'

It is possible from what has already been said of this centurion to imagine that he was a sentimentalist, a man of kindly ways and gentle, perhaps insipid demeanour. Such a conclusion would be utterly mistaken. Discipline is an essential part of his nature. 'I also am a man set under authority.' He was accustomed to give commands and if they were not promptly carried out to deal with the situation thoroughly and at once. If life is to go on with any system and any success there must be some entitled to give orders and others responsible for obeying them.

Somehow, somewhere, the centurion had heard of Jesus and his quick mind and sympathetic spirit had detected in these tales a character that appealed to his own, capable of decision and of dealing with critical situations in a final and satisfying way. Into the hands of Jesus he was ready to commit the sad condition of his servant and the distress of his own mind. The Master would not fail them.

Do you wonder that Jesus was startled by such largeness of heart and sureness of response and cried out with words of commendation that must have burned themselves into the minds of all who heard them?

As the words of the ancient Hymn of St. Patrick seem to express the faith commended by Jesus, so let us too say—

I bind unto myself to-day
The power of God to hold and lead,
His eye to watch, His might to stay,
His ear to hearken to my need,
The wisdom of my God to teach,
His hand to guide, His shield to ward,
The word of God to give me speech,
His heavenly host to be my guard.

The New Testament Doctrine of the Incarnation.

By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D.(Oxon.), Gerrard's Cross.

I.

Probably the earliest reference to the Incarnation, whereby the Son of God became man, is that found in Gal 4[4]: ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. 'But when the time had fully expired, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, to redeem those who were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.' In this

text we have already the equal emphasis upon the divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ, and it is noteworthy that the Incarnation is immediately linked with the Redemption wrought out on Calvary. This close association of the Birth of Jesus with His Death is characteristic of Pauline teaching and, indeed, of New Testament doctrine as a whole. The Incarnation and the Crucifixion are indissolubly connected. It is the atoning work of His Death and Resurrection which reveal the significance of His Incarnation, just as it is the truth of the Incarnation which gives significance to the Cross and makes possible the Resurrection.

It is no exaggeration to say that Paul has little interest in the Incarnation by itself, apart from its bearing upon the Cross and the Resurrection. Even in Ph 2^{5-8}, his fullest exposition of the fact of the Incarnation, which we shall consider later, the focal point of interest is the 'Death on the Cross' and the Exaltation which followed. In Ro 1^{3-4} the significance of the Birth of Jesus is that it is the first step upon the road to the Resurrection. In Ro 8^{3} the purpose for which God sends His Son is to deal with sin upon the Cross. For Paul the Cross and the Resurrection occupy the foreground of his thought, and the Incarnation is in the background.

This fact can best be brought out by contrasting Paul's emphasis with that of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John. In these writings the Incarnation is treated as having importance in itself and in its own right, and is given equal emphasis with the Crucifixion and Resurrection. Even here, however, the Incarnation is closely associated with the Cross. In the first chapter of the Gospel, where we have the most complete theological statement of the Incarnation in the New Testament, the whole exposition leads up to the proclamation 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away [ὁ αἴρων] the sin of the world' (*v.*[29] cf. *v.*[36]). But 'John' is more concerned than Paul with the significance of the Incarnation in itself as the revelation of God. 'The Logos became flesh, and tabernacled amongst us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth' (*v.*[14]). 'No man has ever seen God; the only begotten Divine One [reading μονογενὴς Θεός] who is in the bosom of the Father, He has unfolded Him (ἐξηγήσατο, *v.*[18]). The Incarnation has profound significance in itself and in its own right as the revelation of God in His only Son, Jesus Christ, Divine, yet human. According to Jn 12^{45} Jesus said, 'he that seeth me seeth him that sent me' (ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με), and in 14^{9}, 'he that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν Πατέρα).

It is characteristic of this contrast between the Johannine and the Pauline emphasis, that, whereas John usually speaks of the Father 'sending' or 'giving' the Son, Paul usually speaks of Jesus as 'giving Himself.' John speaks of God the Father as 'sending' the Son no less than forty-seven times (ἀποστέλλω eighteen times in the Gospel and three times in the First Epistle; πέμπω, in the Gospel, twenty-six times). Paul, by contrast, speaks of God as 'sending' His Son only twice (ἐξαποστέλλω, Gal 4^{4}; πέμπω, Ro 8^{3}). John also speaks of the Father as 'giving' (δίδωμι) the Son in Jn 3^{16} (cf. 6^{32}). Paul, too, speaks of the Father as 'delivering up' (παραδίδωμι) the Son in Ro 8^{32}; but his characteristic expression is that Christ 'gave himself' (Gal 1^{4}, 1 Ti 2^{6}, Tit 2^{14}, δίδωμι) or 'loved . . . and gave himself' (Gal 2^{20}, Eph $5^{2, 25}$, ἀγαπάω and παραδίδωμι). Even in Ph 2^{7-8}, the initiative is represented as being with the Son (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν . . . ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν). The reason for this contrast is, of course, that in the Pauline passages cited the primary interest is in the Crucifixion, whereas in the Johannine there is an equal interest in the Incarnation itself, as the Father's revelation of Himself in the Son.

But, although 'John' dwells far more than Paul upon the Incarnation itself, as the Revelation of God, nevertheless for 'John,' as for Paul, the Incarnation and the Cross are intimately united in their significance. Jn 3^{16-17}, for instance, is as much an Easter as a Christmas text. Similarly in Mk 10^{45}, Jesus Himself brings together His Incarnation and Crucifixion in one famous text: 'For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many [λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν].'

II.

The nearest approach to a *theory* of the Incarnation in the New Testament is the passage, already referred to, in Ph 2^{5-8}: (Moffatt) 'Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus [τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]. Though he was Divine by nature [ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων], he did not set store upon equality with God [οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ], but emptied himself by taking the nature of a servant [ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών]; born in human guise and appearing in human form, he humbly stooped in his obedience even to die, and to die upon the cross.' [ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.]

The purpose of Paul in this passage is practical and homiletical. He is exhorting his readers to the practice of love and humility after the pattern of Christ. The Christological doctrine arises incidentally by way of illustration, but it is none the less

significant for that. Paul clearly states the pre-existence of Christ in equality with God, and the great condescension involved in the Incarnation and Crucifixion. It is in the latter that the self-humiliation, begun in the Incarnation, finds its completion and goal. The main theme of the passage is Christ's rôle as Suffering Servant upon the Cross. The phrase ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, 'He emptied himself,' has been made the basis of elaborate Christological speculations; but in Paul's mind it probably signified simply the self-sacrifice and self-humiliation begun in the Incarnation, and completed upon the Cross. It is undoubtedly true that the Incarnation did involve for Jesus Christ a κένωσις in the sense of relinquishing some of the attributes of Deity, such as omnipresence, omnipotence (*e.g.* Mk 6^5) and omniscience (*e.g.* Mk 13^{32}). This self-limitation, however, was not necessarily present to Paul's mind in writing this passage: he is concerned simply with our Lord's self-humiliation, revealed in the Incarnation and still more upon the Cross, for which He was rewarded with the glorious Exaltation.

A somewhat similar conception of our Lord's condescension in the Incarnation and Crucifixion is expressed in 2 Co 8^9: γινώσκετε γάρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὤν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχείᾳ πλουτήσητε. 'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, although he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich.' The riches of Christ here referred to are the riches of His pre-existence in heavenly power and glory which He relinquished in the Incarnation for the sake of sinful men. The poverty for which He exchanged His riches is the humiliation involved in the Incarnation, but still more in the Cross. The chief difference from the Philippians passage is that here the resulting exaltation is that of Christians, whereas in Philippians it is that of Christ.

III.

Finally, let us turn to the records of the Birth of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. Mark, of course, gives us no account of the Nativity. His interest, like Paul's, is concentrated mainly upon the Passion of our Lord. We turn, therefore, to Matthew and Luke. The accounts of the Birth of our Lord in Matthew and Luke are clearly independent of one another, but they agree upon the fact of the Virgin Birth. The MSS. authority for Lk 1^{34-35} is unimpeachable. So is that for Mt 1^{18-25}. The whole Lucan account which gives such prominence to Mary, while it keeps Joseph in the background, requires the statement of the Virgin Birth to explain it.

Those who reject the story of the Virgin Birth usually do so on the ground that, apart from the first chapter of Matthew and of Luke, the New Testament has no reference to it. From the fact that earlier writers like Paul and Mark make no mention of it, the adverse critics conclude that the story is a legend of later invention. The case against the Virgin Birth is therefore based largely upon the argument from silence, which is notoriously precarious. Another argument advanced against acceptance of the Virgin Birth is that the notion of a Virgin Birth was suggested by a misunderstanding of Is 7^{14}, where the Hebrew word עַלְמָה, 'young woman,' is mistranslated by the LXX as παρθένος 'virgin.' But this is very unlikely. This Isaianic prophecy had no prominence in Jewish thought or expectations. It was the fact and circumstances of the Birth of Jesus which directed attention to it and brought it into prominence. The fame of the prophecy rests upon the Virgin Birth of Jesus, not vice versa. The Virgin Birth has independent basis in fact.

What motive could have led Christians to invent the story of the Virgin Birth, if it was invented? The answer usually given is: a desire to provide an additional argument for our Lord's divinity. But the fact is that, at the period of time when the legend is alleged to have been invented, the great need was not to prove our Lord's *divinity*, which was generally taken for granted by Christians, but to prove His *humanity*. If the story of the Virgin Birth is untrue, it must have been invented comparatively late. It would have been impossible to gain acceptance for it, if untrue, while the persons most intimately acquainted with the facts, such as Mary and the brothers and sisters of Jesus were still living. If it was fictitious, then it could not have been invented till towards the end of the first century. But it was precisely at this time that the Gnostic Docetists were spreading their heresy that Christ's humanity was only apparent, and not real. The supreme need and desire of the Church was to combat and defeat this heresy. Echoes of this controversy are to be heard in the New Testament itself (*e.g.* 2 Jn ^{7}: ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί· οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος; cf. 1 Jn 4^2). The chief danger confronting the Church arose from the denial, not of our Lord's divinity, but of His humanity. Hence the stress laid on the fact of His manhood: ὁ Λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο. In view of the prevailing need to safeguard our Lord's humanity, it would have been a singularly unpropitious time at which to invent a legend of His Virgin Birth. The fact that the record of the Virgin Birth was cherished, in spite of these disadvantages, is itself a guarantee of its essential truth, and of the fact that it had already established itself in the mind of

the Church before the Docetic controversy arose. Of course public reference to the Virgin Birth, while the relatives of Jesus were still living, would have been indelicate. It is not surprising, therefore, that the only published records of it that we have are comparatively late.

That the Eternal and Infinite Son of God should become man is in itself a miracle so astounding that it is not surprising if it was attended by miraculous circumstances. But the essential message of the Incarnation is independent of these special circumstances, and may be summed up in the words of 1 Ti 1[15] : 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

The New Roman Psalter. Widely discussed in Roman Catholic circles has been the significance of the Papal permission for the new translation of the Psalms into Latin,[1] prepared by the Jesuit Fathers of the Biblical Institute in Rome, to be used for liturgical purposes. It is well known that not even Jerome's translation from the Hebrew into Latin secured a place in the Vulgate Bible, or in liturgical use, and that the official rendering of the Psalms has never been more than a translation of a translation. The break with long-established tradition is, therefore, manifestly significant. The Rector of the Biblical Institute has now published a small book in Italian [2] and in French [3] setting out the reasons which led to a general desire for a new and authoritative rendering of the Psalms, the principles on which the work rests, and the problems that confronted the translators. The new translation rests primarily on the Hebrew text, but on a critically restored text, in whose restoration the Vulgate and other versions were considered, and sound, though cautiously applied, principles of textual criticism were allowed. The complexity of the problems that arose in this connexion are excellently illustrated. Further problems arose in the choice of the particular sort of Latin to be employed, as to whether it should be classical or late Latin, or something between the two. The precise rendering of important terms found repeatedly in the Psalter brought a new crop of problems, while the desirability of securing a rhythmical quality in a version designed for liturgical use—though not in classical Latin metres, but in a form which preserves something of the spirit and genius of Hebrew poetry—still further complicated the task. While there have been some critics of the new translation, and while complete agreement on the text or rendering of every passage could hardly be expected, there has been a wide welcome to the new Psalter, and a chorus of praise from both Catholics and non-Catholics. Fr. Bea gives some examples of the Catholic views expressed, and publishes a long list of articles in which the new version is reviewed or discussed. His book is illuminating for all who are interested in the problem of the translation of the Bible, and may be commended to many who will not use the new Latin Psalter.[4] It is informative throughout, and every student of the Psalms can learn from it, while those who suppose translation to be a simple task may realize their error, and those who recognize it to be difficult may realize that it is even more difficult than they had supposed.[5]

[1] *Liber Psalmorum cum Canticis Breviarii Romani* [1945]. Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Rome.

[2] *Il nuovo Salterio Latino*, by A. Bea, S.J. ; 2nd ed. 1946. Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Rome.

[3] *Le nouveau Psautier Latin* [1947]. Desclée, de Brouwer, Paris. The French Edition is not a literal and exact rendering of the Italian, but is somewhat modified in places, though it is substantially a translation.

The Assumption of the Virgin Mary. Within the Roman Catholic Church there is a growing movement having as its object the proclamation of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary as a dogma of the faith, just as the Immaculate Conception and the Papal Infallibility were made dogmas in the nineteenth century. Professor J. Coppens in a short monograph on *The Definability of the Assumption*,[6] has now broken what he calls the eloquent silence of some eminent Catholic theologians who are obviously not in favour of this movement, and has come out in open and effective criticism of it. While he professes his own belief in the reality of the Assumption, he firmly opposes the idea that there is the slightest Scriptural or patristic authority to establish any historical basis for the doctrine, and argues that it would be unwise to handicap the faith with a dogma which cannot be established by evidence that would be accepted by scientific historians. Professor Coppens writes with skill and with no little courage, and non-Catholic readers, who are not directly interested in the question of the Assumption of the Virgin, but who wish to be well informed about the Roman Catholic Church and the currents of its thought, will find this study illuminating and informative.

Exegetical Studies. Professor Coppens has also published a further collection [7] of *Biblical Studies* [8] in the series 'Bulletin d'Histoire et d'Exégèse de

[4] Mgr. Knox has now published a translation of this Psalter into English.

[5] It is not clear why the Reformer, Sebastian Castellio appears as Chastillon on p. 23 of the French edition, and as Chateillon on p. 134.

[6] *La définibilité de l'Assomption* [1947]. Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges ; Fr. 15.

[7] Cf. The Expository Times, lvii. [January 1946], 109.

[8] *Miscellanées Bibliques XI–XVII* [1947]. Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges ; Fr. 10.

l'Ancien Testament.'[1] The first deals with three parallels with the Psalter found in the Ras Shamra texts (Ps 110^3; Ps 110^{6b}, where Coppens reads רַבִּים for רָבָּה, and connects with the mythological monster *rbm* of the Ugaritic texts; and Ps 82^7, where again a reference to mythology preserved in Ugaritic texts is found). The second study adduces Ugaritic support for the interpretation of the concluding words of Ex 7^{19} long ago suggested by Eerdmans, which connects them with the sap of trees and springs of water. The third revives a view of Ex 11^1 which Van Hoonacker once proposed and then abandoned; for בְּשַׁלְּחוֹ כֻלָּה he reads כְּשֻׁלַּחַת כֻּלָּה[2] 'as a bride is sent forth' (*i.e.*, loaded with gifts, cf. יְשֻׁלּוּחִים). The next study is a critical review of that section of Dubarle's *Les Sages d'Israël* which treats of Gn 2f. Professor Coppens then turns to examine some recent tendencies in exegesis, especially in England. Here he notes the tendency to regard the evangelists as theologians, representing the faith of the Early Church, rather than as witnesses to the historical facts of our Lord's life and teaching, and a tendency towards allegorical interpretation. He confesses the disappointment with which he read Hebert's *The Throne of David*, because of the latter tendency, and warns his readers against the dangers of both these movements. To the question of allegory he returns in the sixth study, and it is clear that he regards this as a serious danger to sound exegesis. His final study propounds a series of exegetical principles which may be warmly commended. He emphasizes the necessity to penetrate the original thought of the writer by a careful study of his words, based on sound philology, and by a study of the literary and historical context of a passage, and then to expound the text without burying it beneath a mass of learned verbiage. For the task of the exegete spiritual penetration is required as well as learning, and the Christian interpreter should see all *sub specie Christi*.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[1] This is No. 20 of the series, and it brings it to a close. Its place will be taken by the *Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia*.

[2] Better retain בְּשַׁלְּחוֹ since בְּ is a preposition and not a conjunction.

Entre Nous.

Vedanta and the West.

For some considerable time a group of enthusiasts in America have been issuing a bi-monthly magazine, which they now call 'Vedanta and the West.' With a winsome honesty Mr. Christopher Isherwood confesses that it has had an 'extremely small circulation.' And in the hope of widening the circle of their influence, they have gathered together a selection of past contributions to the paper into a volume which, though the Introduction is dated October, 1945, has only now appeared among us—*Vedanta for the Western World* (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net).

The *Vedanta* is, of course, a major effort of the human mind and spirit, and demands study. But what we are offered here is mixed feeding. In the four hundred and fifty pages there are seventy essays by various hands; not all noticeably relevant to the general title. Universally brief, some of them are slight and flimsy, but others have real point and interest, while one or two make something of a contribution. Of the sixteen or so authors drawn upon, the best known, while the keenest and most eager to share with others what they themselves have found, are not the most effective for the purpose in mind. Mr. Aldous Huxley has some eighteen essays, some of which have already appeared elsewhere; Mr. Gerald Heard a dozen or so, and Mr. Isherwood about half that number.

These are alert and eager minds, with a sheen of brilliancy about them. Moreover, they are fine writers, with a cutting edge to their words. In Anatole France's phrase, they leave something of themselves at the end of their pens, which he prescribes as an infallible method of gaining a public. And yet it is possible that that something of themselves that appears in their writing may stumble certain of their readers. And in this way. Most of us, I imagine, who are in the ministry, have, on occasion, been all but shamed out of it by reading the sermons of a really great preacher. That, we felt, is the authentic note, and I just have not got it. Here is a man who lives with God, and has the right to speak of Him to others, as I, living far more remote from Him, have not. Without impertinence may one suggest that while these brilliant writers, notionally, know their subject well, and while they imply, no doubt accurately, that they themselves are working hard at the more difficult practices of advanced religion, as yet, there is something missing in their eager propaganda. It is amateur; it is external; it has not the spiritual feel about it. Mr. Huxley, for example, has some really excellent material in this book, but he has also three reflections on the Lord's Prayer, in which he glides gracefully to and fro, cutting skilful figures, on the frozen surface of deeps of which he seems entirely unconscious, as he skims over them. The result is not good propaganda.

Mr. Huxley once gave us a key to his own mind. He has had a varied mental history, which at times took him into odd places. In 'Ends and Means' he tells us that 'I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able

without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. Most ignorance is vincible ignorance. We don't know because we don't want to know.' In the present volume, in an arresting study, he asserts that nothing can change the fundamental pattern of one's temperament. One must accept that; and make the best of it. Mr. Huxley has not escaped from himself. He can still believe what he wants to believe; he can still ignore what he does not wish to see.

Thus others in this book are much more likely to convince, and to spread their faith;—Swami Prabhavananda, for example, whose essays, including five studies on the Sermon on the Mount, are not the least moving of the contents of this volume. Whether he fully satisfies or no, he is a born teacher, who deals with some of the things that we want to know. One feels a liking for the man himself, has the sense that he speaks from the inside, and so one listens to him with respect and in humility.

For the rest, like India itself, the *Vedanta* is a whole continent, with many mental languages in it, and the most diverse climates. To give you some idea of the geography of this book its authors owe much to Patanjali and to Ramakrishna, both august spirits. And here are a few of its contents —What Yoga is; My Discoveries in Vedanta; Divine Grace; Towards Meditation; Religion and Temperament; Distractions; Dryness and Dark Night; Control of the Unconscious Mind; Warnings and Hints to the Spiritual Aspirant; Samadhi; Buddha and Bergson; Notes on Brother Lawrence; and so on. A. J. Gossip.

'The Plague' and 'Monsieur Vincent.'

Writing on the Incarnation as giving a new sensitivity towards the sufferings of men Mrs. Bliss—in *The Christian News-Letter* for 22nd December—contrasts a novel and a film of 1948. 'In a remarkable novel published this year, called *The Plague*, Albert Camus describes an imaginary outbreak of bubonic plague in the town of Oran, seen through the eyes of the town's medical officer. Camus is a secular existentialist, and his novel shows how a group of different men and the crowd of the population at large respond to the horror of the plague's developing fury. The doctor, assisted by the quiet presence of his old mother, plods steadily forward on his duty; a Parisian journalist caught there bends every nerve to bring about an illegal escape, and turns down the offer of a passage through the blockade when it finally comes. The central figure, whom none of his friends can place in any profession or any class, works doggedly but with a certain detachment, partaking yet observing. Just before his death he reveals to the doctor the motive spring of his life. He is overwhelmed by the thought of human suffering, and especially by the suffering that is inflicted on men by their fellows. He is determined to pit his life against this suffering. His ambition is to be a saint. But he does not believe in God: in fact, he says that if there were a God he would not feel called upon to strive against suffering or to give up his own desires, for if there were a God it would be His business to deal with this, the outstanding feature of the world He is supposed to have made. It is a novel that Christians ought to read.

There has also just come to this country from France a film which is a little masterpiece on the same theme. It is the story of St. Vincent de Paul, under the title *Monsieur Vincent*. Seventy-five million francs were contributed by a hundred thousand French people to finance its making. The figure of St. Vincent is human and compelling. He, too, is drawn to find his life work among the poor in a ministry to suffering. But the strength of his life comes not from his making a few thrusts and stabs against a torturing scheme of things: all he sees, all to which he ministers, is made bearable by the thought of the divine mercy on which his life is stayed. And when a comparison is made it is not the Christian saint but the secular saint who seems a little overdrawn, a little more than human, and stretches our credulity as we ask whether it is possible for a mortal man to attempt with his bare hands to push back an avalanche without growing embittered against the forces which make his task unfinishable.'

Poetry and Prayer.

It is seventeen years since the first edition of *Poetry and Prayer*, by the Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A., was published, but it was certainly well worth while to bring out this second edition (Independent Press; 4s. net). It is a beautiful book with a calm, quiet, serene certainty about it which makes it exceedingly helpful devotional reading. In its various chapters it deals with the contribution that poetry can make to the fullest realization of the different kinds of prayer. So there are chapters on Poetry and Adoration, Poetry and Repentance, Poetry and Intercession, Poetry and 'the Communion of the Saints,' Prayer and Sacred Poetry, and Poetry and the Long Pursuit. It is not the modern poets who are dealt with here, but poets like Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Browning, Noyes, Francis Thompson, and Alice Meynell. It is one of the great values of the book that it brings us back to the feet of the great masters.

There are in this book wise things about prayer. 'Prayer must not be considered as a provincial activity of man, as though his personality consisted of a number of states, federated for certain limited purposes, but capable of acting apart; . . . Man praying must be man offering to God all that he has to give.' 'When he prays man lifts up his life into the splendour of God.' 'Prayer becomes the cry of a soul that knows itself.' 'Pity without faith is paralysed.'

William Barclay.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

READ AT HOME

for a London University

B.A. or B.D. DEGREE

In your leisure hours you do a certain amount of serious reading. But is this reading haphazard or is it *planned*? Has it a *definite objective*? Why not read with a view to crowning your efforts with a B.A. or B.D. Degree? Quite apart from other (and perhaps more material) advantages, the work of preparation will widen your outlook and keep you abreast with modern studies.

In recent years many Ministers have taken Degrees by reading at home in their leisure hours under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall tutors.

LONDON B.D.: HEBREW NO LONGER COMPULSORY
Under the latest Regulations candidates may now obtain a *Pass* at B.D. without offering Hebrew, but this subject is still compulsory for those seeking Honours. If you are interested please mention B.D. when writing for Prospectus.

Open to all

You need not go into residence or attend any lectures. All that is necessary is to pass three exams., Matriculation (or, if you are over 23, the *shorter* Special Entrance —see below), Intermediate, and Final; you may read for these at home without interfering with your pastoral work.

Special Entrance Examination

Anyone over 23 who intends to read for a London Degree may take the Special Entrance Exam. instead of Matriculation. Only four subjects need be presented, and these may generally be chosen from among those to be taken for the higher exams. Mathematics is not compulsory. Over 1,400 Wolsey Hall Students have passed this examination.

Wolsey Hall Postal Courses

for the above examinations are prepared and individually conducted by a staff of more than 90 University Graduate Tutors. These Courses comprise Lessons, Test Papers, Model Answers, correction of your work and solution of *all* difficulties by your tutors. A Guarantee is given that in case of failure, tuition will be continued *free*.

● *Write (mentioning examination or Degree) for Prospectus, post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 20,*

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

Genesis 18s.
Principal JOHN SKINNER, D.D.

Numbers 18s
Professor G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., D.Litt.

Deuteronomy *Third Edition*, 18s.
Professor S. R. DRIVER, D.D.

Samuel I and II 18s.
Professor H. P. SMITH, D.D.

Kings *In Preparation*
Professor J. A. MONTGOMERY, Ph.D., S.T.D.

Chronicles I and II 18s.
Professor E. L. CURTIS, D.D., and Rev. A. A. MADSEN, Ph.D.

Ezra and Nehemiah 16s.
Professor L. W. BATTEN, D.D.

Esther 16s.
Professor L. B. PATON, Ph.D.

Job 25s.
Prof. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., and Prof. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D.

Psalms *Two Volumes, Each* 16s.
Prof. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., and E. G. BRIGGS, B.D.

Proverbs 18s.
Professor C. H. TOY, D.D.

Ecclesiastes 16s.
Professor G. A. BARTON, Ph.D.

Isaiah, Ch. i-xxvii 18s.
Professor G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., D.Litt.

Ezekiel 25s.
Canon G. A. COOKE, D.D.

Daniel 25s.
Professor J. A. MONTGOMERY, Ph.D., S.T.D.

Amos and Hosea 18s.
President W. R. HARPER, Ph.D.

Micah, Zephaniah and Nahum; Habakkuk; Obadiah and Joel 18s.
Prof. J. M. P. SMITH, Prof. W. H. WARD and Prof. J. A. BEWER

Haggai, Zechariah; Malachi; Jonah 18s.
Prof. H. G. MITCHELL, Prof. J. M. P. SMITH and Prof. J. A. BEWER

St. Matthew *Third Edition*, 18s.
Ven. Archdeacon W. C. ALLEN, M.A.

St. Mark 16s.
Professor E. P. GOULD, D.D.

St. Luke *Fourth Edition*, 18s.
Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

St. John *Two Volumes, Each* 19s.
The Most Rev. and Right Hon. J. H. BERNARD, D.D.

Romans *Fifth Edition*, 18s.
Prof. W. SANDAY, D.D. and Right Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, D.D., C.H.

I Corinthians *Second Edition*, 18s.
Right Rev. A. ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D.

II Corinthians 18s.
Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D.

Galatians 25s.
Professor E. D. BURTON

Ephesians and Colossians 16s.
Professor T. K. ABBOTT, D.Litt.

Philippians and Philemon 16s.
Professor M. R. VINCENT, D.D.

Thessalonians 16s.
Professor J. E. FRAME, M.A.

Pastoral Epistles 16s.
Professor W. LOCK, D.D.

Hebrews 18s.
Professor JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.

St. James 16s.
Professor J. H. ROPES, D.D.

St. Peter and St. Jude *Second Edition*, 16s.
Professor CHARLES BIGG, D.D.

The Johannine Epistles 16s.
Rev. Canon A. E. BROOKE, D.D.

Revelation *Two Volumes, Each* 25s.
Ven. Archdeacon R. H. CHARLES, D.Litt., D.D.

All Prices are Net.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
New York

T. & T. CLARK
Edinburgh

THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT

By C. B. MOSS, D.D. **15s.**

We are in full communion with the Old Catholic Churches and a full account of the origin and development of these Churches is urgently needed. This book fulfils the need and, using the original sources, traces the history of the Old Catholic Churches. A very readable work of scholarship.

THE REFORMATION IN DENMARK

By E. H. DUNKLEY, D.D. **13s. 6d.**

There has been a tendency to neglect the Church History of the north of Europe. Dr. Dunkley has righted this omission by providing a detailed and readable history of the Reformation in Denmark. He traces the history of the Danish Reformation from the beginning of Christian II's reign in 1513 to the end of the reign of Christian III in 1559.

(Published for the Church Historical Society)

THE ROYAL PEARL

The Life and Times of Margaret Queen of Scotland

By A. M. D. HENDERSON-HOWAT **10s. 6d.**

The life of St. Margaret, and the age in which she lived, is a worthy subject for the pen of a biographer. Mrs. Henderson-Howat combines the research of the scholar with the imaginative insight of the novelist, and the result is a ray of light shed on a personality all too little known.

THE REVISION OF THE PSALTER

By HAROLD RILEY **8s. 6d.**

This book points the way to the revision of the English Psalter that is so badly needed, and also to a more serviceable arrangement of the psalms for Sunday, daily and occasional use than is now provided.

DIVINE HEALING IN GENERAL MEDICAL PRACTICE

By HOWARD E. COLLIER **1s.**

The author, who is a General Practitioner, points out the defects of medical materialism, discusses the effective causes of disease, and emphasizes the fact that treatment by the methods of Divine Healing may result in recovery from an illness, even of a so-called incurable nature.

THE FUTURE OF ANGLICANISM

By A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., Bishop of Derby **6d.**

A lecture delivered on the Charles Gore Memorial Foundation on 12 November, 1948, in Westminster Abbey.

S.P.C.K.

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C.2

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March, 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7. 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*